

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1880.

The Week.

NEARLY six millions of foreign gold arrived here during the week, and foreign exchange at the close warrants further imports. The movement of gold to this country is anxiously watched by the leading European banks, and the Imperial Bank of Germany has again advanced its discount rate. The Bank of France has been urged to do so, but has not, and the Bank of England has taken no action as yet. It is now evident that, while Europe will want a large amount of our breadstuffs, the demand will be much smaller than last year. The yield of wheat in Russia, it is estimated, is hardly more than sufficient to supply the home demand. Last year Central Russia alone furnished Great Britain with over ten million bushels of wheat. The European demand for American securities continues good, however, and the public credit of the United States now rules in London nearly as high as that of the English Government, due allowance being made for the length of time which the securities of these respective governments run. During the month of August our public debt was reduced a little over \$12,000,000. Railroad business continues to be very profitable, and the best class of railroad bonds and shares have in several cases advanced during the week to the highest prices ever paid for them. This is due not only to the large traffic of the railroads and to the easy condition of the money market on account of gold imports, but to the fact that investment money is being steadily driven out of United States bonds by the purchases of the Government for the sinking fund. These purchases during August amounted to about \$10,000,000, and in the last ten months to not far from \$90,000,000. The money thus driven out goes very largely into the next best class of securities. Speculation at the Stock Exchange was active and buoyant during the week, and in all departments of trade activity was the rule. So large is the demand for currency all over the country that the New York banks are not able, even with all the foreign gold coming here, to maintain their surplus reserve, and this was reduced during the week about \$1,000,000. The price of silver in London and here was unchanged during the week, notwithstanding sensational rumors about the intended action of the German Government towards bi-metallism.

Important letters on the subject of the campaign by General Grant and Mr. Conkling have been made public during the past week. General Grant, it seems, is to come to New York and preside at a Garfield and Arthur mass-meeting in the course of the month. Writing to General Logan with regard to this he says, "I agree with you that it will not do to be beaten now"; a pithy sentiment which has proved a godsend to many Republican newspapers which were in want of some ringing cry to "place at the head of their columns." General Grant adds, in a somewhat less simple style, "We should never be beaten until every man who counts, or represents those who count, in the enumeration to give representation in the Electoral College can cast his vote just as he pleases, and can have it counted just as he cast it." There are so many men who "count," or who "represent those who count," in a Presidential election nowadays, that General Grant's exact meaning might have been made plainer without disadvantage. If his intention was to express the same idea that is conveyed in the phrase which the *World* keeps set up on its editorial page, and attributes to General Hancock, "a full vote, a free ballot, and a fair count," and if Hancock did really use this language, the views of the two generals on the subject seem to be identical; in fact, they both seem to be clamoring for the same thing. Mr. Conkling's letter was addressed to a Republican meeting in Rochester, and contains some hearty praise of Abraham Lincoln and the Republican party, but neglects entirely to mention General Garfield. He makes up for this to a certain extent by pointing out "the grave hazard at this time of putting in power the Democratic party, dominated

as it must be." With regard to this "domination" he adds, in a vein which shows that his old power of sarcasm has not yet been exhausted, "The Democratic nominee for President is an honorable man, and therefore he will not try to defraud the party whose nomination he has accepted of the results implied by success." This enables the *World* to say with deep malice, but still truthfully, that Mr. Conkling has called General Hancock "an honorable man." Mr. Conkling adds that his "earnest sympathy" is with the Rochester Republicans "in every effort and purpose to lift high the Republican banner and push on the Republican column," but regrets his inability to lift or push, himself, in person.

The Massachusetts Democratic Convention has resulted rather curiously. The long struggle between the Butler and anti-Butler forces has ended in the complete capture of the organization by Butler, and at the same time the Convention has nominated an old anti-Butler man as its candidate for governor. Mr. Charles P. Thompson is a lawyer of excellent standing in his profession, and was elected to the Forty-fourth Congress over Butler, then a Republican candidate. He is a man of high character, and would certainly make a good governor, but the chances of his election are small. General Butler had the whole Convention in his hands, and could have been nominated himself if he had desired it. Instead of this, he made a thoughtful speech in which he explained his present position. He reviewed the history of the Democratic party in the days of its success and power, incidentally alluding to San Domingo and the "whole group" of West Indian islands, "which sooner or later will come to us, just as sure, in God's Providence, as a necklace of jewels shall come from the bridegroom around the neck of a fair bride." He showed that the Union soldiers were chiefly Democrats, and that "the first blow struck and the first word given" toward the emancipation of the slaves "came from a Democrat in command"; and that since the war the Republican party has been "chained to the car of capital." With regard to the Revolution he declared that, so far from that war having been carried on by capitalists, most of the great men who made up the convention which declared our independence "could hardly have paid their board bills out of their private fortunes." They were "young lawyers, young doctors, . . . young shoemakers, young coppersmiths, young mechanics," and the "gentlemen and capitalists" came in late and after "the movement had got so far it could not be stemmed." He drew a striking contrast between the tendencies of the Republican and the Democratic parties, and expressed the hope that "something like statesmanship" might be the result of this campaign.

If we may trust Republican accounts of the New Jersey Democratic Convention at Trenton last week, a "delirious mob of a thousand delegates," sitting in an "air blue with tobacco-smoke and sulphurous with blasphemy," made a very good choice of candidate for governor in the person of Mr. Geo. C. Ludlow. Mr. Ludlow is a lawyer of character and standing and mature age, who has presided over the State Senate as a member of that body. The weak point in him is that he voted on one occasion to let the State-prison convicts engage in the manufacture of shoes. This implies that he would favor their making hats also, and as hating is a very prominent interest in certain counties the Republicans expect, not without reason, that the shoemakers and hatters will to a man bolt the ticket and vote for Mr. Ludlow's rival, Mr. Potts, also a very respectable man. The fact that the Convention, after endorsing in the gross the Cincinnati resolutions, incorporated a protective-tariff plank in their own platform, is regarded as a futile endeavor, by stealing Republican thunder, to repair the error of their candidate. Now, we have grown accustomed to seeing the Republican party advocate protection as an historic article of their faith, but we are not aware that, outside the State of New Jersey, they couple with it opposition to self-supporting industries in our prisons. The more they inflame the resentment against Mr. Ludlow on this score, the more they will recommend that gentleman to the suffrages of those who

have bestowed a very moderate amount of thought on the moral and economic advantages of convict labor, and who object to any further concessions to Kearneyism on the part of the Republican party.

The hottest work of the canvass is evidently taking place in Indiana, and the candidates for governor have begun a series of joint debates which seem to have been conducted so far with reasonable decorum. More prominence, however, than people at a distance from the scene of conflict could wish has apparently been given to the question as to whether Judge Porter ever publicly referred to his opponent as a drunkard. He is not accused of having done this in anything but a jesting and humorous manner, but it looks as if Mr. Landers attached a good deal of importance to his having done it in some fashion, and made use of the charge not only with the confidence of an immaculate man, but as the fitting climax to a terrific indictment of the Republican party. Judge Porter denies it, nevertheless, in terms of great vigor, and thus the onus of having introduced personalities into the debate falls upon the Democratic candidate. It appears that this is a grave thing in Indiana. As to other portions of the discussion, so far as we can learn, the Republican candidate has had the advantage, despite the fact that he is but just recovering from an attack of illness. His competitor laid great stress upon the Republicans' mismanagement of the finances, a subject upon which he talked with great fluency, and was led into statements that made it necessary for him to protest that he had never been an inflationist, but simply a strenuous opponent of a wicked contraction. But, although the Democratic party had brought the treacherously demonetized silver dollar and the retired greenbacks back into circulation, he did not propose "to monopolize this thing" and claim "the credit that belongs to the Lord" for the present prosperity of the country. Judge Porter's reply to this, inasmuch as he had never before "attempted a speech on financial matters, while that subject has been Mr. Landers's stock in trade for several years," is reported to have been very creditable, and at the second debate Landers went so far as to leave the platform, either in disgust or discomfiture, before his opponent had finished. This discourtesy, added to his introduction of personalities, is severely commented upon, but he appears to get a good deal of applause.

The South Carolina Republican Convention, held in Columbia last week, proved a very singular affair. On the eve of its meeting, the press despatches reported that "the intention seems to be to-night to retire every one tainted with the frauds and irregularities of the past, and to nominate none but men of unassailable character." But when assembled to carry out this laudable design it was called to order by ex-Congressman R. B. Elliott, chairman of the Republican State Committee, and Special Agent of the Treasury Department, who was convicted by the Legislative Committee on Frauds, some years ago, of having bought his election to Congress by drafts upon the "Armed Force Fund" of Gov. Scott's régime. Presently the Convention went into secret session with closed doors, and appointed a committee to consider the expediency of nominating a State ticket. On the following day the committee reported favorably, but were opposed by Elliott, who succeeded in persuading the Convention that such a course would be impolitic. Accordingly it resolved merely to present an electoral ticket, and that the party should make such a contest for Congressmen as it could. Conformably to this advice, the Fifth District immediately nominated Robert Smalls, a member of the Forty-fifth Congress, who, in November, 1877, as a result of the same investigation which exposed Elliott, was tried before a mixed jury and convicted of having accepted a bribe of \$5,000 from the *Republican* Printing Company, while serving as chairman of the Committee on Printing of the State Senate.

We must not wonder that, in view of this protracted control of the party by its greatest knaves, sustained no longer by Federal bayonets but by Federal sinecures, the white Democracy in South Carolina considers it a paramount duty, in the words of the *Charleston News and Courier*, "to put down Elliott's political party and to keep it down," and "desire a change of administration at Washington." "The character of most of the United States officials in South Carolina," con-

tinues the same journal, "is a reproach to the Government. Leaving their politics altogether out of the estimate, they are a very sorry crew. There is some stain upon almost every one of them." If this be true, and we have little doubt of it, it supplies an evident reason for Southern opposition to Federal supervision at elections where such creatures as Smalls can be put up and perchance elected, with the aid of the Treasury Department. Moreover, do not such incidents make honest Republicans, when they speak of a suppressed "Republican" party at the South, ask themselves what possible meaning the term has there, and whether, as it furnishes no criterion of principles or of character, it stands for anything but a purely artificial political division? And if such divisions are in the nature of things unstable as well as pernicious—like the carpet-bag governments, which could not stand alone—is there any cause for regret in the fact that in South Carolina and in Georgia the "Republicans" have decided to abandon a State ticket?

In Arkansas the Republicans have accepted practical effacement with the same submissiveness. At the election for State officers on Monday there were but two tickets in the field, Democratic and Greenback, and the majority of the former is probably about fifty thousand. The repudiating constitutional amendments have, it is now thought, undoubtedly failed. The returns of the Vermont election on Tuesday, which show a Republican gain over the election in 1876, indicate that the situation there is about as depressing for the Democrats as that in the South is for Republicans. The contest was accurately though enviously described in advance by Mr. Blaine as a "dress parade," and yet "the untirred" had no thought of disbanding. Their example in Vermont and Rhode Island may be commended in this sense to discouraged Southern Republicans, as it is practically just as bad to be in a hopeless actual, as in a hopeless virtual, minority.

We beg to direct the attention of our readers to a review of a history of Windham County, Conn., which will be found on another page. It will be found to furnish peculiarly seasonable reading at the present moment. It gives a picture of intolerance towards a lady keeping a school for colored girls, in one of the most enlightened counties in New England, within the memory of any man not over sixty (the victim is herself still living at the West), the like of which we venture to say can be found in no "campaign story" of Southern outrages. We call attention to it thus prominently for the benefit of those—many of them pure in intention and honest in belief—who are busy preaching the doctrine that the Southerner who kicks against negro suffrage and negro politicians is a new and obnoxious variety of human being, who cannot be reasoned into humanity and enlightenment, but must be for ever denounced and voted against and suspected. We have no doubt there are hundreds in Windham County, Connecticut, to-day who roll their eyes in unaffected horror when they hear that the South Carolina whites become turbulent and unscrupulous when threatened with a State government composed of the Elliotts and Smallses. To all such we say: Read what your own fathers felt about having one colored school in their town, and what they did in order to get rid of it; and learn from the story to believe in the power of time and knowledge and trade and education over your Southern countrymen, against whom you allow demagogues and sentimentalists to lash you into perennial hate and distrust. Learn from it, too, that human nature is much the same in all parts of your country, though blessed with much better surroundings in some parts than in others.

When speeches like Secretary Schurz's and General Cox's have been made, printed, and given a wide circulation—at least through the press—it cannot be said that civil-service reform has been disregarded in the present canvass. We were glad to note still more recently two occasions well improved for preaching sound doctrine on this subject to a large body of hearers. At the annual reunion, near Cleveland, of the 124th Ohio Volunteers, on Friday week, Mr. Andrew Squire, the orator of the day, devoted nearly one-half of a long address to citations from the testimony of earlier American statesmen against the spoils doctrine, and from Secretary Schurz's speech, to which he added some

timely comments of his own. For example, after pointing out that the Democrats' "genuine and thorough reform" would, in case of their success, mean "a clean sweep of the offices," he said no Republican could blame them, and urged such preparation against "clean sweeps" by any party hereafter as we have enforced on another page. In contradistinction to an eminent Ohio Republican Mr. Squire said, "I believe in 'abroad,'" and proceeded to hold up the example of the English civil service. The same thing was done in Boston at a Republican flag-raising by Mr. Robert M. Morse, jr., who showed how little disturbance in the *personnel* of the administration was caused by Mr. Gladstone's accession upon the defeat of Lord Beaconsfield. We fear, however, that the moral of this was lost upon Mr. Morse's audience by his failure to explain that as the political opinion of applicants is excluded from the tests of fitness for every subordinate office, there exists no excuse for removals under a new administration. It will be observed that both these speakers were Republicans. The Democrats are yet to be heard from. Ex-Senator Trumbull, addressing the voters of Belleville, Illinois, on Monday week, made no allusion whatever to the need of this particular reform, or to Democratic intentions in regard to it, laboring altogether to show why his party "demand, as did the Republicans of 1860, an entire change of administration."

"Straws" have not been as plentiful during the present campaign as could have been desired; but, nevertheless, every now and then we meet with indications of the way the country is going. A Chicago *Tribune* correspondent at Omaha gives an account of a vote taken on a train of cars on which the Rev. Dr. Talmage was homeward bound. He was returning from Leadville and had been "taking in scenes and incidents along the Pacific coast." On the same train which bore the reverend gentleman homeward over the Union Pacific Railroad a Presidential vote had been taken, which resulted in fifty-six votes for Garfield and forty for Hancock; General Crook, who was on board, and Dr. Talmage refused to vote, but it is obvious that their failure to exercise their rights cannot have materially affected the result. This, of course, is a Republican "straw"—a plain, unvarnished statement of facts from which the wayfaring man can draw his own conclusions. To show how different Democratic "straws" are in their origin and composition from this, we may mention that the New Haven *Union* (a Democratic sheet) boasted within a few days about a train of cars on which the ballot stood fifteen for Hancock and six for Garfield. The Meriden *Republican*, however, mentions that "a passenger on the train states that the said canvass was taken on the scoot train from this city Wednesday noon, and that ten delegates from the Democratic Convention in this city were on board, and six train-hands voted, three of them being Democrats." The *Republican* continues: "This explains the unprecedented result of the ballot, and it was rather unkind of the *Union* to conceal the fact that the Democratic delegates were on board." It was not only unkind, it was wrong. What can reformers expect of a party that provides "straws" of this kind?

Mr. Hayes's speech at Canton, at the meeting of the 23d Ohio Veterans, was chiefly devoted to urging the necessity of some national provision for education in the late slaveholding States. The facts, as he states them, are rather startling. In 1870 there were over 4,000,000 people in the South unable to read and write, and more than three-quarters of a million of voters "too illiterate to prepare or even to read their own ballots." This evil, too, is not diminishing rapidly. In 1878 the total school population in the old slaveholding States was over 5,000,000, but of this number only 2,710,096 were enrolled in any school. The conclusion which he comes to is as follows: "Citizenship and the right to vote were conferred upon the colored people by the Government and people of the United States. It is therefore the sacred duty, as it is the highest interest, of the United States to see that these new citizens and voters are fitted by education for the grave responsibility which has been cast upon them." In the same way he thinks that the Indians, the New-Mexicans, and a large proportion of European immigrants all require education which the General Government can best provide. With regard to the Constitutional power to do all

this, Mr. Hayes appears to think that there can be no room for doubt as to its existence, and contents himself with mentioning as to the Territories that the General Government has authority to make "all needful rules and regulations." It would, however, involve a very important change in the hitherto accepted relation between the States and the central Government if Congress undertook to provide the machinery of popular education within State lines. The moral obligation to do something in the premises may be derived from the fact that the negroes have been given the suffrage, but the legal power cannot be got in this way. The speech deserves consideration as a serious suggestion of a definite scheme of political action directed against admitted political evils. So few such suggestions are made in either party that anything of the kind comes as a sort of surprise. We fear, however, that the excitement and noise of the campaign will deafen the country to Mr. Hayes' proposals.

The House of Lords has been acting with so much perversity and obstinacy in Irish affairs as to suggest the belief that the majority was bent both on frustrating all attempts of the Ministry at conciliation and on increasing the madness of Irish malcontents. For their resistance to the Disturbance Bill they had the excuse that it was in some sense an unusual interference with the rights of property, but there is no creditable excuse for their recent defeat of the Irish Registration Bill, which was simply intended to facilitate—that is, make more convenient as to time and place—the registration of voters in the country districts. The rejection of this can hardly be ascribed to anything but rancor, and it is, of course, likely to increase greatly the exasperation which makes the Irish problem such a tough one even for a Cabinet with the most benevolent intentions.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Mr. Forster, on whom so much of the burden comes, should have been stung into an assertion that, if such things were repeated, an alteration in the constitution of the House of Lords would some day become necessary. The "tremendous cheers" with which this indiscretion was greeted is a significant indication of the kind of feeling which the Upper House is exciting in the breasts not only of English Radicals but even of more moderate Liberals. No such utterance with regard to the Lords has, to the best of our knowledge, escaped the lips of a Cabinet Minister since the days of the Long Parliament, and it is not surprising that Lord Granville had to explain in the House of Lords that it was Mr. Forster's own opinion he expressed, and that he spoke for no one else and committed no one else.

General Roberts reached Kandahar unopposed, entering it on August 31. He found Ayub Khan occupying a fortified position at Mazra, on the Argand-ab, which was completely concealed by the intervening hills. Reconnoissances were immediately made, which elicited the fact that the enemy's main camp was on the Baba Wali heights, and that his right could easily be carried and the camp assailed from the rear. This offered an opportunity of totally breaking up Ayub's army, and the preparations were made accordingly, and ably executed on the following morning, September 1. General Primrose, with the Kandahar garrison, about nine o'clock made a direct attack on Baba Wali, which served as a feint to cover the real design, while the cavalry brigade, under Hugh Gough, advanced upon the left, to occupy a position on the Argand-ab suitable for pursuit. The main attack was made by two brigades of infantry, supported by a third, all under the command of General Ross. The turning movement was vigorously opposed at various points, but in vain. The reverse slope of Baba Wali was reached and the camp stormed. At noon the work was achieved, the enemy fleeing in wild confusion. Twenty-seven guns were captured in the camp, and five more—Ayub Khan's last cannon—during the pursuit. Ayub himself made a hasty flight, followed by almost all the other chiefs and a few Herati horse, the rest of his troops dispersing in various directions. He had been joined before the battle by the leaders of the Ghazni faction, and is believed now to be going straight to Herat, which, however, it is thought, may close its gates against him. The loss of the victors was insignificant.

NEGLECTED PRECAUTIONS AGAINST A "CLEAN SWEEP."

THE charge which some critics have been making against the Republican orators in the present canvass, that they are refraining, apparently with care, from all mention of civil-service reform, is not strictly accurate. They all, or a very large number of them, do draw attention to the very serious consequences which would result from the "clean sweep" of the offices which would be sure to result in case the Democrats got into power. On this point they are generally very emphatic in their remarks, and their objection to this clean sweep rests, as far as it goes, upon the very grounds on which the civil-service reformers ask the Republicans to set the Democrats a good example. Every orator, therefore, who urges this argument is *pro tanto* a civil-service reformer. Every voter who is influenced by it into voting against Hancock is *pro tanto* a civil-service reformer. He objects to having the Government offices treated as the booty of the party which happens to get most votes at the polls; to having competent men who are familiar with their work expelled from these offices because they happen to hold a particular set of political opinions and to have voted for a particular candidate. He objects to having the salaries annexed to these places treated as a property subject to a tax to which no other kind of property is exposed—a tax levied, too, without authority of law, and yet, in practice, levied under a penalty, in case of default, to which payers of no other kind of tax are liable, and disbursed by a body unknown to the law, and which renders no public account of the use made of the money. The difference between such an orator and voter and the regular civil-service reformer, who "sips cold tea" and is "goody-goody," and clamors for "the schoolmaster's test," lies simply in the application of the rule. Mr. Sherman and his brother orators think the rule an excellent one, evidently, but think it ought only to be applied to the Democrats, because the Democrats are such bad men and have such evil designs. They would not apply it to the Republicans, because the Republicans are such good men and have such noble designs. This view of moral obligations is a very old one, and has excited the merriment of many generations. But we are willing to concede, for the sake of argument, that it is sound—that the Democrats are bad men and the Republicans good men, and that things done by Republicans might be very harmless which if done by Democrats would be very mischievous. But action based on this view can only be safe—indeed, one might say can only be rational—if accompanied by precautions as insurmountable as human skill and strength can make them against the Democrats ever coming into power.

We need hardly say that no such precautions are possible, or desirable if possible. This Government, like every other constitutional government, is framed and carried on on the theory that two parties or more are contending for possession of power, and that power may, and perhaps frequently will, pass from one to the other. If there were no such theory elections would be a farce. Voting is the exercise of a choice between two sets of men and two sets of ideas. All the speeches the Republican orators are making to-day are appeals to the voters not to make any change in the depositaries of power; but they are also very emphatic admissions that the voters *may* make such a change next November. If there were no likelihood or no risk of their making it, there would be no occasion for the speeches, and the voting would be a mere form. Moreover, power has heretofore often passed from one party to another in the United States. The Federalists gave way to the Republicans; the Republicans gave way to the Whigs; the Whigs gave way to the Democrats, and the Democrats gave way to the Republicans again. No rational and intelligent Republican would maintain that no other similar change is likely to occur, or that the Democrats, or some party essentially embodying their spirit and aims, are sure not to get hold of the Government in place of those who now hold it. As a matter of fact, the Democrats for some time back have been in actual possession of Congress in both branches, and came within a hair's-breadth of securing the Presidency in 1876. Moreover, no observant man can deny that the Democratic tide has, for some years, been slowly rising—that is, that the voters who have the Democratic way of thinking about government and legislation have been for some time gaining on the Republicans, and diminishing their majorities in States in which the Republicans have been

strongest. We may, therefore, set it down as undeniable that the Democrats, or some other party like them, may come, and very probably will come, into power again. In other words, Democratic ascendancy—we are now looking at the matter from the standpoint of a very Stalwart Republican—is one of the dangers to which the Republic is most exposed. It is more likely than a foreign war, for which we prepare by keeping a militia on foot; more likely than a run on the Treasury, for which we prepare by keeping a reserve of specie; more likely than the inability of the Government to pay cash in a great national emergency, for which we prepare by affirming its power to manufacture and issue paper money; more likely than that the separate States should destroy the Federal credit by taxation, for which we prepare by forbidding such taxation in the Constitution. In fact, there is hardly a single risk to the National Government or its belongings, now guarded against by either the Constitution or the laws, which is nearly so probable as that the Democrats will one day get possession both of the Presidency and Congress, and be thus enabled to make that "clean sweep" of the public offices, with its attendant horrors, over which our Secretary of the Treasury and his brother orators are so eloquent.

It is, therefore, proper and desirable for every voter who hears them to ask them what preparations they have made for this contingency which they paint in such black colors. A party in power in Holland, whose orators, every time they took the stump, declaimed on the horrors of inundation, but made no mention of what they had done or proposed to do about making or repairing dykes, would naturally call forth much interrogatory criticism from the audience. The Republicans who are conducting this canvass, from General Garfield down, seem to us very much in this position. They lay themselves open to some very awkward questions, of which we may give the following as a sample:

"If, as you confess, the danger of the Democrats getting possession of the Government is not an imaginary danger, and if, as you say, they will, if they get power, make the dreadful thing called a 'clean sweep,' you, as the party which has for fifteen years held the Government in all its branches, and in a measure created the civil service as it now exists, must surely have taken some means to prevent this clean sweep. What have you done? You cannot possibly believe that the Democrats will be prevented, if they get a chance, from turning your men out and putting their own in all the offices, by the feeling that they are themselves too wicked for such an undertaking. Have you, therefore, passed any law or constitutional amendment making a 'clean sweep' impossible when there is a change of administration? If not—if this has been impossible—have you made an effort by your own example to embody in American political usage the rule that a man's tenure of office in the public service shall not depend on his political opinions, but on his character, skill, and efficiency? If so, where, when, and to what extent? You dwell a good deal on the power of the 80,000 offices on the corrupt imagination of the Democrats in stimulating their exertions at the coming elections; now, what have you done by your own practice to rouse popular feeling against the doctrine that the offices are the fair prize of party victory? Is there anything in your example to suggest to any Democrat that treating offices as 'spoils'—that is, giving them to the members of one party exclusively as the reward of electioneering—is a disreputable system? Can you imagine any spectacle more likely to stimulate their cupidity than the spectacle you are yourselves offering to the world at this moment of the levy of illegal assessments for your own purposes on the salaries of your office-holders? Would there not be something ludicrous in one of you preaching the sacredness of property to a mob from a balcony while his confederates were gutting the house and dividing the goods in full view of the street? When your candidate, too, proposes publicly to fill offices by the advice of Congressmen of his own party, can you expect a Democratic President to refrain, whenever he gets a chance, from doing likewise? Your plan, too, or at all events the only plan you offer, of preventing the derangement of the public business by a sweeping change of public servants is keeping *you* in power, because your men, having been twenty years in the business, understand it. But does not this suggest to your opponents the obvious answer that when you began you were as green and awkward as they would be, and that they have as much right to learn to administer by long administration as you have, and will draw as good an argument from this

source against being turned out of office at the end of twenty years as you now draw? In fact, does it not seem as if your allusions to the evils of change were highly unbecoming in you, who have carefully maintained a system which not only tempts millions into clamoring for change, but makes the change, when it does come, in the highest degree mischievous?"

"THE CORMORANTS AND THE COMMUNE."

WE print elsewhere a letter from a highly esteemed correspondent which is in several ways very suggestive. The personal character of a possible Vice-President is undoubtedly a subject of legitimate interest to voters, and a man's "treatment of his unfortunate debtors" is an important indication of character. But no man's personal character can be depicted to the voters in a trustworthy manner by the researches of a campaign newspaper reporter among his private papers. To any one who knows anything of the frame of mind in which this functionary enters on the examination of a candidate's life and manners, there is something very ludicrous in treating his revelations of any candidate's treatment of debtors as a proper basis for a judgment about his humanity. The one thing certain which appears from the list of Mr. English's foreclosures is that he made a large number of loans to persons whose credit was very poor, and on the only security they could offer, and presumably at the legal rate of interest. Any one who makes great numbers of such loans must needs, unless he means to lose a great deal of money, or convert his property into a charitable fund, make a great many foreclosures. Mr. English, it appears, made three hundred and ninety-two within the last two years, which proves that he had made three hundred and ninety-two loans, and did not seek to enforce his security until there was no other way of getting either principal or interest, for he could not foreclose until the debtor defaulted on both. It suggests, too, that he had probably made twice as many loans on mortgages which he did not foreclose, because he could not, unless he were Satan himself, select as his debtors only those who would be sure to become insolvent. Moreover, it appears that the security in those cases in which he did foreclose was very poor, because in most of them he had to buy the property in himself and got it, in the absence of competition, for less than the assessed value. The theory of his critics, therefore, apparently is that he ought to make thousands of loans on mortgage, but not foreclose in the only cases in which foreclosure would be necessary—that is, where the debtor is poor—and ought to have taken the property himself in the open market, not only for more than any one else would give, but for enough to cover his debt. We should like to know who has ever foreclosed a mortgage on anybody but a poor debtor. Foreclosures on rich or well-to-do debtors are at least very rare. The mortgage is taken lest the debtor should become poor. There is not a particle of proof that Mr. English was harsh in his treatment of the debtor in any case. He may have been; but every transaction between a creditor and debtor has two sides to it, and before being used against the character of either should be examined by some impartial tribunal. The last person in the world to report on it is a campaign reporter getting up "stories." We know nothing about Mr. English's private affairs, but we think the researches among his foreclosures, and the inferences based on them, have been more ludicrous and discreditable than such things usually are. It may be that Mr. English has used his "capital as an instrument for wrecking," but do not let us convict any man of this on the strength of a list of foreclosures published in the midst of a canvass, with comments of his own by an industrious "staff correspondent."

It is to be observed, too, that a man who has a house and lot to pledge for a loan of money is usually a man of considerable intelligence, who knows what pledging it means, and knows the probable consequences of any failure to pay the interest on the loan. Moreover, the law protects him in this kind of a loan against any sharp practice on the part of the creditor. The creditor cannot snap him up for one, two, or ten days' default, as an insurance company can, and cut off his equity of redemption. The law gives the debtor ample time to look about him for means of relief in the shape of a fresh loan, on the same property, or on other property, or the sale of the property itself. So that the presumption is,

and Mr. English is entitled to the benefit of this presumption as well as everybody else, that mortgagers are a class of men who understand their own business, who know what risks they run when they make a mortgage, and who are prepared to bear the penalty of their default when the time comes. According to the campaign view of these English debtors, however, they are a band of unfortunate paupers who borrow money on contracts to which they do not expect to be held, and who are grievously wronged because they are held to it.

If it be asked why we attach enough importance to this particular campaign story to make it the subject of any lengthened discussion, we answer because it has made more impression on the public mind than such stories usually make, and seems to have a more substantial basis than such stories usually have; but, above all, because we think it a kind of story which the Republican party should by all means avoid as a weapon of attack. The Republicans appeal to the country in all their platforms and speeches as *par excellence* the conservative party, which is the only safeguard of industry, property, intelligence, and order against that combination of violence, envy, slothfulness, and greed known as "the Commune." "The Commune" is, in fact, frequently referred to by Republican orators as one of the things we have to fear if the Democrats get back into power, and some of them were so much frightened by it last year, even, that they were almost prepared to protect themselves against it by the sort of veiled dictatorship called "Grantism." We do not deny that there is something in the country which may be called "the Commune"—that is, a body of persons who look on all owners of capital, no matter whether composed of the workingman's savings or the idle man's inheritance, as their natural enemies, and to whom all power, influence, or authority acquired by superior training, skill, or intelligence is detestable. The Greenback party contains a considerable body of them; the Democratic party contains most of them. They are the sworn enemies of public and private credit. They like high taxes, to be paid by the industrious people who save. They like also to have money made plenty without labor, by the free use of the printing-press. They hate colleges and all institutions of learning as producing persons with marks of mental superiority to the simple Democrat who carries the hod up to the bricklayer. They do not care to have the world carried forward in civilization, because their highest ideal of civilization is expressed in the phrase "plenty to eat and drink and little to do." They are the curse of any country in which they abound, and though they are less numerous in this country than in most others they have the power of making more trouble. They have within a year or two arrested the prosperity and seriously endangered the future of one American State—California. They may any day disorganize the industry or lower the credit of some other in which they may happen to secure a temporary ascendancy or hold the balance of power. The "cormorant" clause of the Democratic platform was put in in order to placate them, and by "cormorants" they understand everybody who has savings out at interest. They are as hostile to the investments of the savings-banks as they are to those of Mr. Vanderbilt. Any country which was governed by them, or had its domestic or foreign policy shaped by their ideas, would speedily disappear from the community of civilized states.

Now, all indiscriminate abuse of capitalists and "money kings" for heartlessness and greed furnishes these people with their whole stock in trade. A capitalist ought to be reprobated for heartlessness, greed, and extortion when he is proved guilty of them, but no sooner. We have no right to infer heartlessness, greed, and extortion from the fact that he has much money and many debtors, and brings many foreclosure suits or holds people to their contracts. We must let him live under the common law and hold his character on the same tenure as other people. So, also, it ill becomes the Republican party, as the party of intelligence and education, to endorse such sentiments as Mr. G. F. Hoar's denouncing General Hancock because he was regularly trained in the national military school and had honorably followed the calling for which he was trained, and had not, like General Garfield, begun life as a day-laborer. This view of the comparative merit of callings and careers is essentially Kearneyite and barbarous. What we need in the United States is more, and not less, regular training for honorable callings, and steady pursuit of the callings for which the training has prepared. It is to be regretted that a

man of General Garfield's capacity should have passed the best learning years of his life on a tow-path, and it is to be desired that all boys as bright as he should be saved from such a waste of time if possible. It is greatly to General Garfield's credit that he should have overcome the disadvantages of this early loss of time; but it is not to any other man's discredit that he was enabled to avoid it, and to pass his youth in school. To preach that it is to supply the nourishment on which Communism grows, for what the Communist seeks is not so much that the poor should have more knowledge as that the rich should have less, and he therefore hates and despises the fortunate son of an honorable and conscientious father who has labored and saved that his children may get the best equipment for the work of life which the community in which he lives can give.

PARLIAMENTARY OBSTRUCTION.

LONDON, August 26, 1880.

PROBABLY before this letter reaches you the Parliamentary session will have come to an end. It has been marked by a struggle between the efforts of the Government and of the majority to do the business of the country, and of the minority in opposition to prevent that business being done. The temporary return of Lord Hartington to the leadership of the House of Commons has probably been to the advantage of the Government and of the party. He possesses a certain thickness of skin, a lack of which is Mr. Gladstone's chief defect as a politician. When there is any question of argument or persuasion, when the ministerial majority has to be roused to decisive action, when an obstructive minority has to be taught that the forces of the country are behind the Prime Minister, Mr. Gladstone is without rival or second. But in dealing with the vexatious details of obstruction Lord Hartington's slower intelligence and less sensitive temper give him great advantages. He allows things to pass partly because he does not perceive the point to which opposition is directed, partly because he is not stung into retort by attacks which he does not feel and therefore does not resent. He does not by any copiousness of ideas or speech contribute to prolonged discussion. Assaults to which no other rejoinder is made than a few matter-of-fact sentences, or a supercilious taciturnity, followed by a request to the House to proceed at last to business, are sooner over. It cannot be truthfully said that Lord Hartington is greatly aided by the colleagues who sit by his side. Only two of them have any remarkable power of debate or great position in the House of Commons. These are Mr. Bright and Sir William Harcourt. Mr. Bright speaks with an authority inseparable from his age, his long parliamentary career, his position in the country, his disinterestedness, and his eloquence. He is respected even by those who hate him. It cannot be said that Sir William Harcourt has any weight with the House of Commons at all. The sentiment, perhaps, does him injustice; but he is looked at as a man who is only accidentally on the Liberal side, as a counsel who has taken the brief which came to him first, and whom a little more promptitude might have retained for the party and cause against which he now contends. Mr. Bright's occasional insolence and arrogance have a moral dignity of real conviction about them which shines through the rudeness of his language and bearing. If a savage, he is a noble savage. He is fighting for what to him are his hearths and altars, against greedy and sacrilegious invaders. Sir William Harcourt's offensiveness of tongue and post is resented as an outrage, because it is regarded as the indecorum of a licentious advocate.

I dare say all this is very unjust. But it is the Opposition view of him, and it inflames the dislike and fear with which he is regarded by an infusion of contempt. The office which Sir William Harcourt holds brings him more frequently before the House in replying to questions and in the detailed discussions of committee than any other would have done. The Home Secretary has, moreover, to arrange matters with members in the lobby more frequently than any of his colleagues. This is involved in the peculiar business which belongs to his department. Sir William Harcourt is not specially fitted for his work; and if, as is said, of all the great ministerial offices that which he fills is that which he least desired to have, his distaste proceeded on an ample basis of self-knowledge.

The other members of the Cabinet in the House of Commons are respectable heads of departments. Mr. Childers adds to a mastery of the routine of administration a knowledge of parliamentary management and a superficial tactical skill which would probably have made him a good whip. He has an eye for the emergencies of the moment, and a skill in devising evasions of difficulties and plausible excuses for glaring blunders, which are estimated perhaps above their intrinsic value in the House of Commons. Mr. Forster has been too much occupied in getting into false positions and out of them to give much general help to the Ministry. He is a dreary figure lost in the Irish bog which has engulfed, though not, perhaps, beyond the possibility of recovery, his reputation for statesmanship. Mr. Chamberlain's sudden eleva-

tion to the Cabinet, at an age at which most men are content to be under-secretaries, and after a Parliamentary career scarcely long enough to justify selection for office at all, has roused jealousies which seem to have suggested to him a certain modest self-effacement. But he is a trained man of business and a dextrous political manager; he has the official and Parliamentary manner, and his future is well assured. After a personal elevation without recent precedent he does well to wait. Mr. Dodson belongs, like Mr. Childers, to the class of official and Parliamentary experts, but he is scarcely to be counted as a directing or controlling influence in Parliament. In Mr. Gladstone's absence Lord Hartington does not receive much help from his colleagues in the Cabinet in his conflict with the tacticians of Parliamentary delay.

The first practitioners of obstruction in the House of Commons were Mr. Raikes, Mr. James (more familiarly known as Jim) Lowther, and Mr. Cavendish Bentinck, the two latter belonging to great aristocratic English families. The *Lord Eskdale* of Lord Beaconsfield's political novels was the Lord Lonsdale whom Wordsworth suffered to protect him, and to whom he paid in poetry the debts due for patronage. Mr. Jim Lowther is a scion of this great Tory house. Mr. Cavendish Bentinck belongs to the Dutch and ducal family whom William III. established in England. Both these gentlemen, together with Mr. Raikes, distinguished themselves by their strength of constitution, which enabled them to sit up late o' nights under Mr. Gladstone's former Government; by their strength of lungs, which made them unwearied in articulate speech and inarticulate interruptions, and by their capacity for taking minute and constant exception to every detail of every question which was brought before them. On the principle which is adopted when a desperate poacher is turned into a gamekeeper, or as a thief used in olden times to be enlisted as a thief-taker, Mr. Raikes was appointed when Mr. Disraeli came into power to be chairman of committees. Knowing every artifice, and having practised most of them, by which the forms of the House can be evaded for the purposes of delay and resistance, he was well fitted to watch over their execution and to maintain them against transgressors less bold and skilful than himself. Mr. James Lowther was made, first, Under-Secretary of State, and then Chief Secretary for Ireland, and Mr. Cavendish Bentinck became Judge-Advocate General. The example of their promotion has not been lost upon the aspiring Tory youth of the present Opposition. Political youth has a very long duration, and a man at fifty in the House of Commons is supposed to be just beginning his career. Lord Randolph Churchill, Sir Henry Wolff, and Mr. Gorst, among the Conservatives below the gangway, are practising the arts which were pursued with success by Mr. Raikes, Mr. James Lowther, and Mr. Cavendish Bentinck. They will doubtless have their reward. They have already hustled aside poor Sir Stafford Northcote, who scarcely affects to control the party which he nominally leads, and is little more than a figure-head and symbol of a political chief.

But it may be doubted whether they will succeed in their more immediate purpose. They are bent upon wasting time, and the Government is wisely giving them as much time as they like to take. It has hitherto been, to use the phrase of Lord Hartington, an unwritten law of Parliament that it was to rise early in August, some days, at least, before the 12th, and only in the extreme cases to remain sitting a few days after it. If business was not done, so much the worse for business. The measures which there was no chance of passing before a certain date had to be dropped and to be started with anew in the next session. Mr. Gladstone has adopted a new course, which it is to be hoped will be persisted in. He is resolved to keep Parliament sitting until the measures which are brought before it shall either have been passed or shall have been definitively rejected. He has made up his mind not to allow the deliberate proposals of the Cabinet to slip through the Ministerial fingers. If either House refuses to pass them, the blame or the merit of their refusal, as the case may be, will be clearly ascertained and the Government will be without responsibility. This method has provoked vehement outcries of indignation. Attempts have been made to censure the Ministers for pressing measures at a time when, it is alleged, they cannot be fully and fairly considered. But they can be fully and fairly considered in September or October, if the peers and members of Parliament will remain in town to consider them. If they choose to go away for their own amusement or on their private affairs, it will be for the country to confide its business to persons who will attend to it at any and every season. The existence of a class of professional politicians in the United States is sometimes sneered at, and sometimes deplored as an evil injurious to the working of republican institutions, and as one from which England is happily free. But we have in this country another evil. A very large number of members of both Houses are persons to whom a Parliamentary career is simply an amusement—something to occupy their leisure when they are in town and cannot be killing something on the moors or among turnips. To them the two Houses are simply clubs of mixed politics, like the Athenæum or the Travellers'. It is these people who maintain that only so much business ought to be done as can be packed between the months of February and August, and that whatever cannot be accomplished within that time must be

abandoned till another session. If Mr. Gladstone succeeds in teaching legislative amateurs on both sides of the House that this understanding will not hold good for the future, he will render very considerable service not only to his own administration but to Parliamentary government in England. The venerable man of letters whom it is the custom to speak of as the Sage of Chelsea is in the habit of appealing to the history of the past half-dozen years as a proof that Parliamentary government, or, as he calls it, the national palaver, has broken down. Talk has superseded work, in his view. While the choice was between talk and work, the opponents of changes which they disliked naturally preferred talk. When the choice comes to be, not between talk and work, but between talk and sport, talk will be sacrificed and work will be done.

†††

Correspondence.

MR. ENGLISH'S MORTGAGE RECORD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In this week's *Nation* you ridicule the attention paid by the Republican organs to the record of Mr. English's mortgage foreclosures. Permit me to remark that I think no one with the slightest sense of humor can fail to enjoy the delicious contrast between that record and the denunciation of "cormorants" in the Cincinnati platform which Mr. English mounted with so much alacrity. That demagogical appeal invited, and I think justifies, precisely such an attack upon a candidate open to it.

I venture to add that the personal character of a possible Vice-President is a subject of legitimate interest to voters, and in nothing are certain important traits more clearly revealed than in a man's treatment of his unfortunate debtors. I have had considerable experience in mortgage investments, and I must say that no one of ordinary humanity will sell out and buy in a debtor's homestead, except as a last resort of self-protection and after stretching indulgence to its utmost. This the long record of Mr. English's foreclosures would seem to show that he had habitually not practised. Again, while mortgage investments are a perfectly legitimate employment of capital seeking merely security with interest, we are all of us familiar with cases in which the capitalist uses them for another purpose—as instruments for wrecking; his object being, not the safety of his money, but to profit by the misfortunes of his debtor to obtain property below its value; and this, again, is presumptively indicated by Mr. English's record. This process of acquiring wealth is strictly legal, but it never serves to elevate a man's character with his neighbors or to increase their willingness to entrust themselves to his power.

Very respectfully,

**

CAPE MAY, August 20, 1880.

THE SOUTH AND PUBLIC EDUCATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your answer to "J. B. S.'s" communication on "Republican Threats of Rebellion," contained in No. 790 (August 19) of the *Nation*, induces me to relate a fact that was brought to my attention some ten days since, while on a visit to Northampton County, North Carolina.

I was out hunting, and there passed me on the plantation-road that led to the county-road some eight or ten colored children of different sexes, between eight and fourteen years of age, I should judge. On being asked where they were going, the oldest said "to school," and they all had their books in their hands. I found the oldest was studying third arithmetic, English grammar, geography, and I believe natural philosophy. Their teacher was a colored man, and their schooling was given them at the expense of the county, under the general school system of the State. The white children have separate schools and white teachers. Up to the close of the war the parents of these children were the slaves of the gentleman on whose lands I was hunting. Northampton County has a population considerably over 15,000. The blacks largely preponderate. There were but five prisoners in the county jail. The crops (cotton and corn) are the finest seen since the war, cultivated almost exclusively by colored labor on shares, or at a rent of two bales of cotton for twenty-five acres.

I come now to your remark: "We cannot recall at this moment a single attempt on the Democratic side to provide by legislation for the fact that the negroes are now free, very ignorant, and liable to great oppression." If you will refer to the speeches by Senators Vance, Ransom, and other Southern senators, delivered last winter in the Senate on this subject, "as to what the Southern legislatures have done for the education of the colored race since their emancipation and the Democratic party has had control," you will find reason to change your opinion. If the author of "A Fool's Errand" is correct when he says the only solution of the problem of negro elective franchise is time and education, I think you will find that the South, by legislation, has

done in that direction as much as lay in her power; and it must be left to time and the ability on the part of the South to do more, when her ability is greater, unless President Hayes's plan is adopted, and the universal education of the colored people be undertaken by the General Government—as to the propriety of which there would doubtless be an irreconcilable diversity of opinion, as people now think. Possibly a few more decisions of the Supreme Court might enlighten us as to what powers Congress does possess as to matters relating to the freedmen in the South under the recent Amendments to the Constitution.—Very respectfully,

WM. H. S. B.

BALTIMORE, MD., August 31, 1880.

[We had in our mind, and ought to have expressed it more clearly, the national Democratic party, and the "Democratic side" in Congress. Of these we believe our remark is strictly true. We were, of course, well aware that the Southern State governments were doing something, some of them a great deal, for the education of the blacks.—ED. NATION.]

THE PRIESTLEY RIOT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Mr. A. V. Dicey (*Nation* of August 12), in speaking of the B stillé anniversary, seems to imply that Dr. Priestley was *present* at the tavern dinner which was the pretext of the Birmingham riot of 1791. This is an error. Though doubtless in full sympathy with the party there assembled, he sought to avoid needless grounds of irritation. In his "Appeal to the Public on the Riots in Birmingham" (Works, vol. xix. p. 373), he says:

"With the dinner itself I had, in a manner, nothing to do. I did not so much as suggest one of the proper and excellent *toasts* provided on the occasion, though it was natural for my friends to look to me for things of that kind, if I had interested myself much in it; and when opposition was talked of, and it was supposed some insults would be offered to myself in particular, I yielded to the solicitations of my friends, and did not attend."

Mr. Dicey must be jesting in suggesting that Priestley was "dreaming" of the *mob* when he pleaded for the "supremacy of the people"—Priestley, who stood so stoutly for education and all things that go to make the mob impossible. The scandalous feature of the riot was that, if not actually planned and instigated, it was certainly winked at and rejoiced over, by the local *clergy of the English Church*. They were the "mob" which had worried Priestley for years and finally drove him to this country. Even Burke (Priestley heard from a friend in the house with Burke) could not conceal his exultation when told of the sacking of Priestley's house. It was not the "people," in any proper sense, that did the deed, nor had Priestley any "awkward *argumentum ad hominem*" to face.

H. D. C.

NEAR THE GRAVE OF PRIESTLEY, NORTHUMBERLAND, PA., Aug. 28, 1880.

MRS. SWISSHELM CRIES ALOUD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: You do me a great injustice when, in your review of 'Half a Century,' you speak of my desire to see Indians exterminated. I have never had any such desire; but, on the contrary, have persistently opposed the Penn policy, on the ground that it exterminates Indians. In the book you review is this passage, given in denunciation of that policy:

"If, by gentle means, Mr. Lo can be persuaded to stop taking all the wives he can get, extorting their labor by the cudgel, and selling them and their children at will, all well and good. Millions are expended on the persuading business, and prayer poured out like the rains in Noah's flood, without any perceptible effect; but still they keep on paying and praying, and carefully abstaining from all means at all likely to accomplish the desired result. All the property of every tribe must be held in common, so that there can be no incentive to industry and economy; and if the Indian refuse to be civilized on that plan he must go on taking scalps and being excused, until extermination solves the problem."

Is not this true? Do not the mass of thinking people regard the North American savage as incapable of civilization? For eighteen years I have stood protesting and insisting that the exceptional savagery of our savages is due to the exceptional conditions in which they have been placed by the exceptional people who have dictated a policy they have been unable to control; in other words, that William Penn and his maudlin sentimentality are the cause of the exceptional savagery of our savages, and exterminate them.

You mean to be generous when you excuse my "incoherence" and "shrieks" by assuming that I lost control of my nervous system in 1862; but eighteen years of hysterics is an untenable position. In what way should any one give utterance to the words you quote, believing, as I do, in their literal truth? If you saw a railroad train full of people rushing toward a broken bridge, would you not shriek your warning? Shall I see the Christian

people of our Eastern States, the people I revere, rushing blindly into blood-curdling crime, and not shriek! shriek! gesticulate! "cry aloud and spare not," beat my breast and swoon with agony to find I cannot make them hear, cannot induce them to forbear? To me the sun at noon-day is not more visible than the complicity of Eastern Christians with Indian massacres. "They know not what they do." Like the sleep-walker who cut off his friend's head, they are doing most terrible deeds in utter unconsciousness. Gabriel will not blow his trumpet to arouse them, and I can but use my poor little penny whistle, on the principle that a mosquito might wake a man in time to save his life. Oh, no! "I am not mad, most noble Festus, but speak the words of truth and soberness," when I say to you, to the Eastern people *en masse*, "Ye have taken and with wicked hands have crucified and slain the innocent! You it was who took those eight Minnesota babies, tied them, two and two, by one wrist each, and threw them across a fence, tied their parents where they must see their agony and hear their shrieks, and left them there to die; and these were only eight of the one thousand murders committed at one time for which you are responsible! Did you not arm the murderers with the most effective, deadly weapons—the weapons they used in this work—and stimulate them to it by the assurance that they should not be punished, nay, that they should be rewarded for their crimes? Are not Indians always rewarded for a massacre, and is not this reward given in response to the demand of Eastern philanthropy?"

You are mistaken about my scouting the idea of the Indians having any title to the land. On page 223 of 'Half a Century' is this:

"William Penn disclaimed the right of conquest as a land title, while he himself held an English estate on that title, and while every acre of land on the globe was held by it. He could not recognize that title in English hands but did in the hands of Indians, and while pretending to purchase of them a conquest title, perpetrated one of the greatest swindles on record since that by which Jacob won the birthright of his starving brother."

By what legerdemain of logic do you draw from such premises the conclusion that I endorse "the woman-whippers of Georgia" in their treatment of the Cherokees? I hold that a civilized nation has as much right as a savage tribe to acquire land by conquest, and you conclude that, if this be so, a band of brigands or brigadiers has a right to defy the laws of the nation of which they are a part, laws they have sworn to obey, and forcibly expel men from the lands assigned to them by the nation.

After disposing of my sins of commission you turn to those of omission, and say "one must not turn to this volume for any light on the causes of the Sioux outbreak, on the extent of the massacre, or on the justice of the multiple hangings which succeeded it; nor, either, for an explanation of the failure of our Indian policy, or for one humane or practicable suggestion how to redeem it!" I am sorry, now, that in my anxiety to be brief I have given so much cause for this charge, but it is not altogether just. On page 229 I state what I believe to have been the cause of that outbreak, viz., a plan to assist the rebellion; and give some of the evidence on which this belief is founded. On page 207, in describing the trains of Red River—Ironless Carts—I give this hint of the cause of failure in our Indian policy: "In these trains were always found Indians filling positions as useful laborers, for the English Government never gave permission for idleness and vagabondism, among Indians, by feeding and clothing them without effort on their own part." I intended, by this, to indicate the whole cause of our failure in dealing with the Indian question. As for my remedy, I have published it so persistently in newspaper articles, from the platform, and in petitions to Congress, that I thought every one was tired of seeing and hearing it, and shall be glad if you will lay it before your readers. It is this:

Article One. Tumble the Indian Bureau into the Potomac.

Article Two. Put a washstand in its place.

Article Three. Place every Indian under the protection and jurisdiction of the laws of the State or Territory in which he may be found.

Article Four. Give to every head of a family one hundred and sixty acres of land, in fee-simple, and make his title inalienable; then let him dig or die.

You say truly, that to me "the Northern sentiment of pity for the aborigines is abominable," and could not overstate my loathing for that mother of crime, or for that whole sentiment which would convert "the Friend of sinners" into the Friend of sin. The pity which is always on the side of vice against virtue; the pity which has taught this Government to pay tribute to any half-dozen savages who may please to make war upon it; the pity which nerves the arm of the stalwart murderer, as, with raised butcher-knife, he pursues the Christian mother and her babes, and buries his death-dealing weapon in their flesh; the pity which assures him of justification when he subjects mangled and dying matrons, maidens, and infants to his brutal lust; the pity which is with the barbarian in his war against those men and women who plant Christian houses, churches, schools, and libraries on the lair of the wolf, is, to me, altogether and inexpressibly abominable.

JANE GREY SWISSHELM,

CHICAGO, August 27, 1880.

CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM PUBLICATION SOCIETY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Nothing could be more gratifying than the letters on the Civil-Service Reform Publication Society which you published in the *Nation* for September 2. They show clearly, what has often been asserted, that there are plenty of men in the country who understand thoroughly the bearings and importance of the question at issue in civil-service reform, and, the moment the right cue of action is given them, will join in the movement.

I think the right cue of action has now been given; and as we love our country we must not fail to follow it out.

I feel free to say that there are thousands, as yet unheard from, scattered over the country, who as soon as the idea reaches them will back our Publication Society with their voice and wealth. It is our part to see that the idea does reach them. Let the gentlemen who have written letters to the *Nation*, and all others interested in reform, take action in their several communities. Let them write to their local papers, explaining the subject, and calling on all Independents to send their names to the Independent Republican Committee in New York. Let them mention the matter in clubs and societies, and by every means in their power induce their neighbors to pledge support, and call for a grand meeting to be held as soon as possible.

The iron is now hot. We must strike before it cools. We must have a monster meeting and rouse enthusiasm. As one of your correspondents suggests, this is just the nick of time. Everybody is in the humor for talking politics, and any action on our part would be sure to be widely known, and would draw full attention to our object.

I think our meeting should be held within the next week or so—at any rate, as soon as possible, before the holidays are completely over and men settle down to their business.

F. G. S.

PHILADELPHIA, September 6.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I presume there will be little difficulty in raising five thousand dollars a year for the proposed Civil-Service Reform Publication Society by either five-dollar or fifty-dollar subscriptions. If it can be done by five-dollar or ten-dollar subscriptions so much the better, as the interest in, and influence of, the Society would probably be greater than if it was in the hands of a few.

It will be a point gained if the Society starts free from the charge of being in the interest of any political party, and if some existing organization could be used that result might be attained. Might not the Social Science Association undertake the work, increasing its membership with special view to this object?

C.

PHILADELPHIA, Ninth Month 4, 1880.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I approve of the idea of your correspondent, "F. W. H.," in your issue of August 19, as to forming a Civil-Service Publication Society, and can promise five subscribers at five or ten dollars each whenever it is organized.

Yours truly,

H. WALKER, J.

PITTSBURGH, PA., August 30, 1880.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: As one who would gladly contribute to the support of a Civil-Service Reform Club, as suggested by your correspondent, "F. W. H.," I beg leave to present a few considerations which I believe do, or should, affect the minds of Independents in the present campaign.

Your correspondent suggests that in order to accomplish anything such an organization as he recommends would be obliged to support either Hancock or Garfield. It seems to me that this course would be most unwise, for it must be admitted that neither of the candidates, nor the party which supports either, has given any assurance on the subject which may not be discarded when convenient, and to the discomfiture of those who may undertake to make promises on behalf of either. Take Hayes's Administration as a warning. It would hardly be safe to promise anything definite on the part of Garfield and the Republican party, and the fact that nothing more definite can be predicted of General Hancock and the Democrats shows how completely the politicians have thrown vital questions into the background, and how shrewdly they are rallying the rank and file to the support of extinct issues and party records.

In this state of affairs your correspondent's suggestion, that the argument in favor of reform should be simply that it is *right*, should lead to an attempt to bring a moral force to bear on both parties, and perhaps if a few enlightened clergymen could be induced to present from their pulpits the true state of the present evil, viz., that the distribution of the Federal offices is a vast corruption fund, a fund measured in value by the amount of the salaries of these offices, used as direct bribery by the "Bosses" and "Ringsters," public attention might be roused sufficiently to enable reformers to take some decided

action. Unless, however, it be found possible to bring a strong influence to bear, I venture to suggest to Independents that, putting all other questions aside, there is one event that may force these questions to the front, viz., a collision between Hancock and his political supporters in the distribution of offices. It can hardly be believed that Hancock, in the event of his election, can fail to see the momentous importance of this question, or fail to pause before the undertaking of such sweeping changes as some of his supporters will be certain to call upon him to make.

I admit that there is little more to hope from his silence on this subject than from Garfield's unworthy letter of acceptance, but even supposing Hancock to be utterly weak and with no serious grasp of the question, is it unreasonable to entertain another hope—namely, that should he undertake to dispossess seventy thousand office-holders there would be a large number of intelligent Democrats who would severely condemn such a proceeding; and would not their censure, joined to the outcry from the entire Republican camp, become a force that could not be resisted nor defied? It seems to me that in this view the course of events may thwart the politicians, and further as if the election of Hancock gave promise of bringing this question speedily to an issue.

Very truly yours,

E. B.

CHICAGO, August 28, 1880.

THE LONDON TIMES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: A letter on English journalism dedicated to the *Times* in *Nation* No. 787 runs so wide of the pith of its subject that it is difficult to say whether it says more that it should not say or leaves unsaid that, more important, which it should say to give a fair idea of the *Times*. I can only warn your readers in general not to accept it as an adequate statement of that which may be said about the paper—for some things could only be said by those who have no disposition to say them.

The well-understood principle of the *Times* is to support every measure which it considers wisely Liberal until it is clear that public opinion—i.e., the perception of some dominant public interest of England—is opposed to it, when it must be abandoned as too much resembling the butting one's head against a stone wall. That in following this course it should occasionally contradict itself is only equivalent to saying that it cannot struggle against a determined public opinion; but this contradictoriness is so much dwelt on and exaggerated as to become practically a misstatement, because in general the course of the *Times* is self-consistent and may nearly always be safely predicted. One honors the *Daily News* for its tenacity in defence of Liberal principles; but they are the principles it was founded and is supported to defend. The *Times* would lose its power and support at once if recognized as a party paper, or one devoted to the support of any special dogma or interest. But to say that it does not combat the opinions of the day is to forget or ignore the fact that to the obstinate resistance of the *Times* and its effect on public opinion was, more than to anything else, due the paralyzing of the long effort of the Conservative Government to drive the country into a war with Russia during the Bulgarian war; nor was there any cessation in that opposition until the danger of war was over. Acrimoniously attacked as a Russian organ, it never in reaction became anti-Russian, and only withdrew its generous advocacy of interests espoused by Russia when the more material interests of the proprietors made persistence ruinous.

Nothing is more curious in English character than the excessive energy of action and reaction in regard to exciting questions, so that the men who applauded the mob that broke Mr. Gladstone's windows are now borne off their feet by the Liberal flood. A tide of this kind directed against the *Times* for a few months would wash an obstinate editor and staff out from the office, and leave nobody the better for it, and the proprietors much worse off. I have known Englishmen so fanatically hostile to the *Times* that they absolutely refused to read it. Yet with this fanaticism forcibly brought home to the paper as a consequence of its Slavic tendencies, with the strongest influence of the Government and Court pressing on it, I have yet to see that the *Times* during that long and most critical period ever went over to the other side, or further than silence on questions on which it had spoken warmly. It is not true, then, to say that it follows and never leads public opinion. What is better and more just would be to say that it leads as long as it can, and when it can lead no longer accepts the dictates of public opinion. Of course there are occasional exceptions, but this is the fair general statement. With regard to the Afghan question, again, I heard the editor, on the receipt of the telegram with the news of the first hostilities in Afghanistan, express the opinion on the question which to-day he is maintaining, and from which the paper has never widely varied—vindication of English honor and total abandonment of Afghanistan militarily.

A little acquaintance with the mechanism of the journal would have saved your correspondent from some practical mistakes, especially as to men. During all the last years of Mr. Delane's ill-health Mr. Stebbing was the acting editor of the *Times*, as he still is one of the principal collaborators.

When Mr. Chenery came in he was not Arabic professor at Oxford in any proper sense of the term, but held an honorary professorship involving no duties, and was one of the principal editorial writers of the *Times*, and had been for many—if I mistake not, twenty—years; he was, in fact, educated to journalism on the staff of the paper, and he did not change his staff in any material degree. Nothing is more characteristic of the *Times* than the conservatism of its organization. It is difficult to get on the staff, and with common prudence next to impossible to get thrown out. There was never any noticeable degree of disorder or any large changes, and Mr. Chenery had by most of his fellow-workers been long noted as the fittest man for the succession. He is probably as competent a man as could be found for a position in which no man living would not make some mistakes, and he is both eminently judicial and very firm in his opinions. Nor was he in any shape responsible for the opposition to Lord Beaconsfield's Government, which was at its strongest before Mr. Chenery came to the helm.

The present editor is known to be more in sympathy with Mr. Walter than was Mr. Delane, and while Mr. Walter never directly interferes with the conduct of the paper, nothing is more certain than that it would adopt no line of policy which he did not favor. It would be, I think, safe to say that Mr. Chenery would not submit to direct interference; but this sympathy of views between Mr. Walter and him, and his long and complete identification with the conduct of the paper, taken with his appointment by Mr. Walter, knowing him for so many years, secure this result, so that Mr. Walter is practically dictator of the *Times* and its policy.

In the very partial list of the personality your correspondent omits some of the most important names, which is not strange, as the destiny of a good *Times* man is obscurity: no man who does not more or less merge himself in the paper and adopt its general tone would long remain on the staff, if he ever got there; but to speak of the editorial staff and not mention Mr. Clifford is strange, while to leave out the manager, Mr. MacDonald, is like "*Hamlet*" without (not *Hamlet*, but) the *Ghost*, for no man *new* on the paper has so large a part in what it is as he. He is not only business manager but director and controller of the correspondence, and the inventor of the Walter press and of nearly all the improvements which make the mechanical execution of the *Times* possible, as well as of the marvellous organization within the printing-office, as in the intelligence department, which keeps the paper in the position it holds quite as much as anything in the editing of it. Mr. MacDonald is, even more than Mr. Walter, the soul of the *Times*.

Unless Mr. Davidson has retired from the musical criticism by death or resignation lately, Mr. Hueffer is not the musical critic but an assistant of Mr. Davidson, though in all probability to our public Hueffer is better known than the responsible chief, who, in fact, I believe, writes very little.

Of the correspondents, Eber, who has the post at Vienna that Blowitz holds at Paris, certainly is as well worth notice, and the two have very great influence on the tone of the paper in reference to their provinces. One feature of the *Times*, which distinguishes it from all its English contemporaries, is the preference for foreigners as its chief correspondents, and the entire independence in which they are left in the expression of their opinions, even when radically opposed, as often happens, to the editorial tone. Eber is an Hungarian, Blowitz a Czech, Gallenga (the chief of the specials) an Italian, and in the late war in the Balkans two if not three of its specials were American; and at one time, not long ago, the only great capital where an English correspondent was kept was St. Petersburg.

I believe that every person connected with the *Times* is Liberal, nor has it, ever since I have known it, advocated Conservative opinions. Nor is it just to say that in the latter part of the Eastern crisis it "suddenly turned round and became the organ of the Ministry," or that it has as suddenly gone over to the new Government. The *Times* has never, since I read it, been friendly to Mr. Gladstone, nor, if I am a judge, has it ever gone further in support of a Conservative Government than most patriotic and non-partisan Englishmen do. What is true, and a point in which the *Times* sets an honorable example to the press of the whole world—an example in which, so far as I know, the *Nation* is the only paper which follows it—is the allowing in its columns the expression of all sides of every question. As the most important channel of communication with the public, it is especially favored by the communication of the views of every English Government and of some European, and advocates those views if they seem to it reasonable and politic; but there are many questions on which it would be safe to predict that the *Times* will never advocate but one opinion.

In personal questions the *Times* is the only paper in England which refuses a hearing to no one. Let us be just, for the *Times* never defends itself.

AN EX-MEMBER OF THE "TIMES'S" STAFF.

CADIZ, August 14, 1880.

[Some of the above details as to the *personnel* of the *Times* were given by our London correspondent in a postscript on p. 114 of our No. 789.—ED. NATION.]

Notes.

MACMILLAN & CO. have published, in an octavo of 333 pages, uniform with his other works, 'Passages from the Prose Writings of Matthew Arnold.' The title-page gives no intimation as to who is to be credited with the work of selection, but for several reasons we suspect it is not the author himself. In the first place, there is no preface or introduction, both of which it is Mr. Arnold's constant and agreeable habit of supplying in cases where there is far less need of any. In the second place, the arrangement, divisions, and headings are such as his urbanity would have been more likely to sanction than his taste to dictate; and the whole volume has an air of scrappiness and "smartness" which misinterprets a writer to whom context is of unusual importance. Still, it contains many of his best passages, and readers who do not know him may get from it an intimation of the range and variety of his topics. The same house have in press a 'History of Procedure in England during the Norman Period,' by Melville Madison Bigelow.—In a class of text-books which may be thought (according to the teacher and his method) either of the first or of the least importance—readers, namely—Swinton's supplementary series, to be published at once by Iverson, Blakeman, Taylor & Co., will have some claims on attention. The fifth and sixth respectively consist of extracts from seven American and seven British classics.—Rand, McNally & Co., Chicago, have entrusted Mr. J. J. Lalor with the editing of a 'Cyclopædia of Political Science and Political Information,' in three volumes.—The supplement to the first annual report of the Massachusetts State Board of Health, Lunacy, and Charity preserves the independence of the unequalled series of health reports. Drainage and pollution of drinking-water furnish the bulk of the discussion. Mr. E. W. Bowditch's paper on the drainage of summer hotels (aided, as it is, by effective drawings from photographs) has a special bearing on the settlement at Oak Bluffs, Martha's Vineyard, but a universal interest. Mrs. Ellen H. Richards's report on the adulteration of some staple groceries gives, on the whole, a comforting assurance.—We have also received the seventh annual report of the Michigan State Board of Health, which might have been edited and printed to greater profit. It gives details which it is useless to spread before laymen. The most characteristic feature of this report is the section upon the meteorological conditions of the year 1878 in Michigan.—An unpretentious, clear, and important study of the mound-region of southeastern Missouri is made in Part I. of 'Contributions to the Archæology of Missouri,' by the Archæological Section of the St. Louis Academy of Science (Salem, Mass.: George A. Bates). Prof. W. B. Potter gives an interesting topographical description of the deltoid district in question, with the aid of several plans showing the mound settlements; and Dr. Edward Evers briefly comments upon the twenty-four plates of pottery, which embrace not a few remarkable specimens.—Effingham Wilson, London, sends us the seventeenth edition of 'Tate's Modern Cambist,' a standard manual of foreign exchanges and bullion, weights and measures. The work has perforce undergone extensive revision in consequence of the great monetary changes of the past ten years. May the editor be able to say in the next edition as now: "The United States have practically still the 'gold valuation.'"—Students of mediæval art may find their account in examining Camillo Boito's recent illustrated work entitled 'Architettura del Medio Evo in Italia' (Milan).—According to the *Athenæum* the present month will witness the publication of the first number of a periodical devoted to international spelling reform, the *Zeitschrift für Orthographie*, of which Dr. W. Victor, of Wiesbaden, will be the editor. A zealous French reformer, by the way, M. Courtat, sets forth a scheme of his own in a recent 'Monographie du Dictionnaire de l'Académie française,' upon which *Polybiblion* remarks: "Entre l'identité parfaite de la prononciation et de l'écriture et l'orthographe actuelle, telle qu'elle est, il n'y a pas de milieu. . . . Et si chacun s'en vient écrire comme il parle, combien de patois comptons-nous?"—A correspondent more versed in iconography than ourselves calls our attention to the fact that the portrait, in the September *Harper's*, purporting to represent "Caroline, wife of George IV.," is really a portrait of that king's mistress, Mrs. Fitzherbert, after the original miniature by R. Cosnay, now at Wortley Hall, Sheffield.

—A portion of the Boston publishers' fall announcements can be given as follows. Roberts Bros. promise 'Fragments of Christian History,' by Prof. Joseph H. Allen; 'Sanskrit and its Kindred Literatures,' by Laura Elizabeth Poor; a volume of poems by Edwin Arnold; 'Voyage Alone in the Yawl *Rob Roy*,' by John Macgregor; 'Round About a Great Estate,' by Richard Jefferies, and the same author's 'Gamekeeper at Home' in an illustrated holiday edition, with designs by Charles Whymper; 'Stories of the Sea, Told by Sailors,' by the Rev. E. E. Hale; a 'Memoir of Governor Andrew, with Reminiscences,' by Peleg W. Chandler; 'Modern Society,' Mrs. Julia Ward Howe's Concord paper; 'Certain Men of Mark'—living characters—by Geo. M. Towle (who will publish, by the way, through Lee & Shepard, his 'Marco Polo' for younger readers); Coquelin's 'Actor and his

Art,' translated by Miss Alger; 'Verses,' by "Susan Coolidge," and new children's stories by this writer, Miss Alcott, Mrs. Louise Chandler Moulton, and Mrs. Juliana H. Ewing. A good turn is also done to little folks by new editions of Munroe & Francis's time-honored 'Old-Fashioned Fairy Tales' and 'Sandford and Merton.' For novels, Roberts Bros. offer 'The Head of Medusa,' by Miss Fletcher, the author of 'Kismet'; and 'By the Tiber,' by the author of 'Signor Monaldini's Niece.' James R. Osgood & Co. have nearly ready the first volume of their 'Memorial History of Boston,' and have undertaken a revision to the present time of Spooner's 'Dictionary of the Fine Arts,' edited by Mrs. Clara Erskine Clement. Estes & Lauriat have in press 'M. Guizot in Private Life, 1787-1874,' by Mme. de Witt; and 'Rural Bird-Life,' by Charles Dixon, to which Dr. Elliott Coues furnishes a preface. Dr. Coues, in turn, will publish through Lee & Shepard 'New England Bird-Life.' Houghton, Mifflin & Co. announce volumes of poetry by Longfellow ('Ultima Thule') and Holmes ('The Iron Gate'), the product of the last few years; each will be accompanied by a portrait. The indefatigable Mr. Moses King is engaged in bringing out a 'Dictionary of Boston,' and a kindred guide-book, 'The Back Bay District and the Vendome.'

—The recent Boston meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science was one of the most notable in the history of that body. To mention only some of the physical papers—Prof. Graham Bell's, "Upon the production of sound by light" (describing his marvellous new photophone, or mode of transmitting sound along a beam of light, in connection with the telephone); Prof. Alfred M. Mayer's description of his Topophone, and Mr. E. H. Hall's "New action of magnetism on a permanent electric current" (the last two discoveries already signaled to our readers), would give distinction to any scientific gathering. Never, perhaps, were the arrangements for the information and entertainment of members and their transportation on various excursions more satisfactory. Besides the general "Programme of the Twenty-ninth Meeting," the local secretaries published their daily bulletin or "Announcement," paged consecutively, with lists of arrivals, new members, papers filed, hospitalities offered, etc., etc. A handy card map of Boston peninsula, and a large folding map of the city and its environs, made sight-seeing easy, and a pamphlet, "Brief Account of Some of the Scientific Institutions of Boston and Vicinity," showed where the visitor should go. Finally, the custodian of the Boston Society of Natural History, Mr. Alpheus Hyatt, prepared a special edition of the introduction to his "General Guide to the Museum," for the use of members of the Association.

—A writer in the September number of the *International Review* does its readers a service in giving examples of the verse of a South Carolina poet whose work seems to have been less ample than one could wish, after making the acquaintance of these fragments of it. Though "Whittier has warmly commended him as the best of Southern singers," we are informed, his present celebrator is probably right in thinking that to most readers "the name of Henry Timrod will present the doubtful charm of novelty." For the sake of more illustrations we could easily reconcile ourselves to an abridgment of the writer's exposition, which, though enthusiastic and sympathetic, is scarcely critical, and to praise a poet indiscreetly differs little in effect from not praising him at all. From the examples given we should say Timrod's verse was overweighted rather than interpreted by confident comparisons with Tennyson, Heine, and Catullus; but it has an evident purity and fulness of meaning, so opposite to the just convention we all have in mind when Southern verse is mentioned as to be emphasized, perhaps, by its setting in prose less far removed from the conventional notion of Southern critical writing. His "greatest poem," we are told, is "too partisan" to quote, but Northern readers would, we think we may say, be quite as ready to tolerate its animus as to credit the unsupported assertion that it will "be ranked near to Dryden's 'Feast of Alexander' and Lowell's magnificent 'Commemoration Ode.'" Timrod was born in 1829 and died in 1867, after a life not empty of trouble and at the last full of pain, but sustained by a cheerful serenity not unaffectedly depicted here. An incomplete edition of his works was published by E. J. Hale & Son, of this city, in one volume, some seven years ago.

—The remaining articles of the *International* make it an unusually good number. M. Auguste Laugel contributes, in a paper on Lamennais, a distinct literary flavor not too common in current periodicals, and possible only to a writer withdrawn from current discussion in all its phases, and wholly given over to the pursuit of literature as an art. It is a portrait of the priest drawn in lines apparently purely descriptive, but having all the force, as one presently comes to see, of an impersonal critique. Whitefield is treated with less suggestiveness, though with fully as much explicit detail, by Mr. William Myall, of Paris, Ky., who has made the interesting article he could hardly fail to make with such a subject; it is, however, what it might easily have failed of being, candid and discriminating. "Few men," says Mr. Myall, "have succeeded in erecting so lasting a reputation upon so absolute a penury of everything in the human mind which is worthy of immortality." D. G. Hubbard examines with great elaborateness "The Myth of the Virgin in Painting and

Sculpture"; Edwin De Leon writes about "Nubar Pacha and the Armenian Christians" with the acquaintance his Egyptian experience affords, though in rather a rhetorical vein; Mr. John Jay discusses "The Presidential Election" at length, rubbing their war record into the Democrats with a fine remorselessness, arguing from it their profound untrustworthiness, and concluding with a deprecation of any attempt "to reopen the issues of the war and assist in unsettling the issues of the past." The leading article is on "Money," by Professor Bonamy Price, and is naturally a good deal more than the review which it purports to be of General Walker's book on the subject, though it is that too, and as such is none the less severe for its courtesy, which is marked. On the subject of bi-metallism he implies that General Walker has only enthusiastic conviction for a support, and commends by contrast Mr. Clairmont Daniell's pamphlet, 'Gold in the East.'

—The death of Mr. Sanford Gifford removes one of the most popular of the older American painters. Among these, too, his rank was high. He is to be classed with Mr. Church and the late Mr. Kensett among the followers of Cole; and perhaps it would be putting too fine a point upon it to say that his work was inferior to the dramatic panorama of the former or the mild sweetness of Kensett. On the other hand, it would be difficult to indicate clearly the real difference in value between it and such work as Mr. Whittredge's or Mr. Casilear's. It was thoroughly American, we need not say; indeed, it seemed to assert its nationality in a certain soft aggressiveness or placid imperviousness to ideas of painting current in the rest of the world. It was wholly hostile to anything like pertness or even vivacity, and shunned the obvious excellence of more modern methods with a dignity and poise in themselves pleasant to perceive. In pursuing this end it paid a penalty that has been rigorously exacted of it—we think not too rigorously, though the unmistakableness of its old-fashioned character and simple ideal was so great as to make it easy for critics incapable of appreciating either (if there were any such) to deride it ignorantly. The truth is that the canons to which such art as Mr. Gifford's subscribed have now to be recalled by an effort of memory. He did not paint nature as he saw it, and in all probability never essayed to do so. To him a "picture" was not only the different thing from a "study from nature" which it is acknowledged to be on all hands, but it was a transfiguration after some receipt perfectly known to him, rather than a selection and arrangement of natural material even. Light and air, those elusive objects of other than the older American landscape painters, he seemed not to be uneasy about striving for at all. They gave place to the relation known as "aerial perspective," which he sought with evident and ingenuous directness, and in doing so enshrouded all the objects of his pictures in a cadmium mist, by which his work became recognizable anywhere and always, and which seemed, at a certain stage of every observer's æsthetic development, very lovely to behold. As one got tired of it, it became clear that it was tiresome not so much because of its monotony as because of its lack of large significance, and that it was not so much a superficial phase of natural beauty as Mr. Gifford's notion of all beauty whatsoever. In the same way one outgrows a certain order of poetry well known to possess dignity and witness a refined nature. So that the sudden ending of his career is a loss to the body of American artists of a singularly fine and shy personality rather than an irreparable loss to American art.

—The study of early institutions, begun at Harvard under the guidance of Professor Henry Adams, fruits of which have already been laid before the public in the volume, edited by that instructor, called 'Essays in Anglo-Saxon Law,' has been further illustrated by the thesis on which, at the last Commencement, the degree of Doctor of Philosophy was granted to Mr. Denman W. Ross. We speak of it here with reference to a review of the work, in the current number of the *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie*, by Von Inama-Sternegg, of Prague, a voluminous writer on political economy. Mr. Ross's pamphlet is called 'The Theory of Village Communities,' and his aim is to controvert the generally-held doctrine (of which the ablest English expounder is Sir Henry Maine) that private property in land arose out of the disintegration of tribal institutions, and is the final stage of a process of evolution of which village communities form the intermediate term. Dr. Sternegg begins his review with a sharp protest against "the ready-made application by the pseudo-romanticists of socialism" of the results of scientific investigation in this field, which has resulted, he says, in making the work of true students more careful and thorough than ever, and he hails Mr. Ross's work as "a valuable contribution to the conscientious study of historical political economy," which "causes double pleasure—first, because it treats one of the weightiest of social problems in a spirit entirely free from preconceived bias, and is based upon original investigation; second, because it testifies to a lively interest in these problems in the distant West." While the reviewer does not deem settled all the points raised by the essayist, he is of the opinion that "he has unquestionably made himself worthy of great praise in incontestably proving that, since the beginning of documentary history, the Germans have had individual property in land and a settled law of succession."

—The writer of the entertaining account of "A Reindeer Ride through Lapland," in the last number of *Blackwood*, makes the following statement in regard to the designs of Russia upon a portion of that country, which is "important if true." At a Norwegian settlement on the Tana he was present at the trial of the river-superintendent, who was accused of the intention of transferring the river to Russia, and was removed from his post on that account. The Tana for a considerable part of its course forms the boundary between Russia and Norway, but about thirty miles from its mouth the boundary-line turns sharply to the southeast, the river flowing due north and emptying into the Arctic Ocean through a fiord bearing its name. A "scientific frontier" would naturally follow its course, and this is what Russia very reasonably (in accordance with British precedents) desires. By gaining possession of the district included between the river and the sea Russia would not only have the valuable cod-fisheries of the Varanger Fiord, but in the island-town of Vardö would obtain a port which is open the whole year round. The importance of a naval station in European waters from which a fleet could be despatched at any time and to any quarter would be very great. Vardö is now an insignificant place of some twelve hundred inhabitants, but enjoys the distinction of being protected by the most northern fort in Europe. Of the ultimate success of Russia in obtaining this territory the chief official of the district had no doubt.

—The following discussion, excerpted from Mr. W. J. Stillman's Athens letter of last week, has a special antiquarian interest:

"While on the subject of the Acropolis I ought to say that German studies on the great staircase which Beulé excavated have recovered some more fragments of the Temple of Victory, and shown some confirmation of the view previously advocated—that the staircase is not ancient, but a Middle-Age construction. Émile Burnouf, indeed, in one of the latest publications on the Acropolis ('La ville et l'Acropole d'Athènes aux diverses époques'), attacks the whole of Beulé's researches with a vigor in which it is impossible not to recognize personal passions which have led that never too sound archaeologist to neglect the plain common-sense arguments in the question to such a degree that he destroys his own demonstrations. Burnouf maintains, in brief, that the whole western wall and the gate which Beulé uncovered, with the staircase and everything dependent on it, were the work of the Florentine dukes of Athens, and that the so-called restoration of Valerian was really originally a work by Nerio Acciaoli, and restored by Antonio, his son, in haste on the approach of Sultan Amurath. There is not room here to follow all his argument, and it must be admitted that he has made several good minor points against Beulé; but it would not, I think, be difficult to show that in his eagerness to demolish his predecessor he has exposed himself to destructive criticism. So far as concerns the general plan of approach to the Propylæa and the probable character of that portion of the enceinte, I do not believe that Beulé's theory can be attacked; but Burnouf and the later German excavations show that the staircase in its present state is a mediæval work—probably, *me judice*, an incomplete and greatly-modified restoration of the original approach, without which in some such state as is now indicated the position and magnitude of the Propylæa (the structure that stood before the gates—i. e., the nine gates) would be an architectural solecism, even an absurdity. It is clear that the staircase is not contemporary with the Propylæa; but Burnouf's ineffectual struggles to reconcile his hypothesis with the nine-gated approach alone suffice to show the untenableness of his theory, for there is not in the space he would dispose of—viz., that between the landing of the Propylæa and the foot of the present staircase—room to bestow nine gates without making them a weakening of the military defence, and the Pelasgi were too good engineers to put nine gates where three sufficed. The fact is that a sound induction from the Propylæa and its surroundings would lead an investigator to look for some such gate and some such staircase as long as the bastions which once covered the whole approach existed, and Beulé was the third who, following this induction, attempted to find what he finally succeeded in finding. It is indicated in the plan of the Propylæa. Nothing that Burnouf advances goes to weaken Beulé's reading of the existing walls and gate, but, on the contrary, the reading proposed by the former only shows his entire ignorance of antique wall-structure; and his hypothesis that Antonio Acciaoli, in haste to defend Athens against Amurath, had been so careful as deliberately to select the antique material, restore the antique form of the gate with its archaic slope of lintel, and replace the band of Eleusinian black marble, so as to be in keeping with the use of the same in the antique substructure of the Propylæa above, is whimsically absurd. The internal evidence is irresistible that the gate known as Beulé's was reconstructed on an antique model, while something of the old Greek methods, traditions, and reverence remained; and there is scarcely any escape from the further conclusion that this was the work done by Valerian, as history records. The repairs which Burnouf shows Antonio Acciaoli to have made were in preparation for an attack by the Turks, who were already in the Phocidæ! The slightest examination of the wall in which is Beulé's gate will convince any one who has experience in these matters that it is utterly impossible that it should have been constructed only about 1430, as Burnouf would have us believe—the more that, being in a very few years later completely cased in by the massive masonry of the Turkish bastions, no chance remained for the wear of time and weather which it shows to-day most unmistakably. But neither Beulé nor Burnouf offers any valid suggestion as to the position of the Enneapylæ, and if the excavation of the western slope of the Acropolis and the southern of the Areopagus does not disclose some indications of it we must regard it as lost. Burnouf's attempt to locate the Pelasgicon within the inner enclosure of the Acropolis is so wildly at variance with every known tradition that it becomes difficult to give him credit for ordinary archaeologi-

cal acumen. On the whole, it seems to me, we must accept Beulé's conclusions as to the meaning of his own discoveries, as unmoved by any of the subsequent attempts to reconstruct the Acropolis."

—Apropos of De Gubernatis's Oxford lectures on Manzoni we remarked upon the scanty knowledge we possessed of the subject of the book. It was the first attempt at more than a mere biographical sketch, and, although unsatisfactory, was a distinct advance. Since then De Gubernatis has been fortunate enough to be allowed to publish the correspondence of Manzoni with his most intimate friend, the distinguished French scholar, Claude Fauriel. An Italian translation of the letters was published last year in the *Nuova Antologia*, and has recently appeared in book form and passed through two editions already. The title is 'Il Manzoni ed il Fauriel studiati nel loro carteggio inedito' (Rome: Barbèra. 1880). In this second edition the letters of Manzoni (fifty-four in number) are given in the appendix in the original French. The body of the work consists of an Italian translation of the same, accompanied by a commentary by the editor, and illustrated by other letters directed to Fauriel. At Fauriel's death his papers passed into the possession of Madame Mary Mohl, the widow of the distinguished Orientalist, who at one time desired Manzoni to write a life of her friend. This Manzoni, with his usual shrinking from publicity, was unwilling to do, as it would involve his own intimacy with Fauriel, and he was, of course, opposed to any publication of his own letters. They have, therefore, remained unpublished until now. They extend from 1807-1830, and give a great deal of interesting information about the composition of the 'Conte di Carmagnola,' 'Adelchi,' and the 'Promessi Sposi.' They also bear witness to one of the most beautiful friendships in literature, and honor equally the writer and the recipient.

GREEN'S 'HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE.'—II.*

OF Mr. Green's deficiencies we have spoken plainly. They are to a great extent compensated for by his rare capacity for bringing into view the great phases of his subject. In nothing is this talent more clearly manifest than in his account of what he aptly terms "modern England," by which he means the period extending from about the accession of George III. (1760) to a date (1815) within the memory of persons now living. This term of fifty-five years has undoubtedly a unity which divides it at once from the preceding age and from contemporary history. By no writer have its features been, on the whole, better seized than by our author. The object of the present article is to determine wherein this unity from a political point of view (which is the only aspect we have space to consider) consists. In performing our task we make free use of Mr. Green's suggestive chapters, but he must not be taken as endorsing all our conclusions. On two accounts it is specially worth while to direct attention to the unity of an era which is both so near to and in another sense so far from the present day. The first is that the French Revolution broke the continuity of English progress, and there is, therefore, a special danger of missing the real unity of English development. The second is that, when the revolutionary movement storm abated, English political life resumed the path from which it had been forced, and the true key to English history since 1815 is to be found in the set of English policy from 1760 up to the time when it was, so to speak, warped by the force of the revolution.

Of the distinction between modern England and the preceding age (1689-1760) so much has been written that the topic, though interesting enough, is not one to which we care at the present moment to direct the minds of our readers. What is better worth notice is that the reign of George III. is marked by four different movements which are closely connected, and which from their combined influence have given a new turn to the annals of the English people.

First. The policy of Chatham had by 1760 permanently transformed Great Britain into a very different thing—the British Empire. It is this imperial character which gives a new impress to the public virtues no less than to the public vices of the generation which seized India and could not retain America. The sense of imperialism terminated the ill-will between Scotland and England, and enabled the genius of Chatham to convert Highland rebels into the best soldiers of the British army; it strengthened the nation to the endurance of defeat, and to exertions which just a century ago redeemed disaster from every tinge of disgrace. The feeling that Great Britain was the centre of a vast empire is seen from its better side in Goldsmith's conviction that Englishmen were "the lords of human kind"; it is seen from its worst side in the brutal determination to enforce to the utmost rights of sovereignty which fostered the pride of every Englishman. "We have been so very powerful and so very prosperous that even the humblest of us were degraded into the vices and follies of kings." Philosophers and statesmen may deplore the prevalence throughout modern England of the spirit of domination. But historians, whose province is to note facts rather than to moralize on the follies of

mankind, must observe that the good and bad qualities which still mark English society were alike the sign and the result of the movement which produced the British Empire, and will probably last as long as that empire endures. It is at any rate noticeable that imperial sentiment in its best sense, and the vulgar parody of it which is now nicknamed "Jingoism," owe their birth to the condition of politics and society when George III. mounted the throne.

Secondly. The creation of the British Empire, which was itself mainly the offspring of commercial energy, went along with not only an immense extension of commerce, but also with an unprecedented development of the industrial resources of the country. Mr. Green's chapter on industrial England contains nothing which is absolutely new, but it brings into one view a lot of facts of which the effect is lost if they are not combined together. Brindley, Watt, Arkwright, and Crompton did much more than merely make ingenious inventions. Whether they knew it or not, the inventors who enabled Great Britain to make full use of her manufacturing resources as surely turned the current of English history as did the statesmanship of Chatham and Pitt, or the speculations of Adam Smith. It is at least an ingenious theory that the growth of industrialism fostered the religious and humanitarian movement which was characteristic of modern England as, it must be added, of modern Europe generally. It is not a theory but a demonstrable fact that the working of English coal-mines and the growth of English manufactures shifted the centres of population, and with them what may be termed the centre of power from the south to the north, and gave something like a permanent predominance to the mercantile and manufacturing classes. This silent revolution was hardly noted by even so acute a speculator as Burke, yet more than any one cause it was in the end fatal to the system of Whig aristocratic rule, which Burke considered the best form of constitutional government. In any case the imperialism and the mercantile spirit of modern England are closely connected, one might almost say intertwined, with each other. The conquest of India was the achievement of merchants who, unwillingly enough, were driven into the exercise of sovereignty as a means of preserving or extending their trade.

Thirdly. The acquisition by England of the Indian Empire will, to future historians, bear an aspect very different from that which it presented to contemporaries, and in all probability very unlike the ideas which it suggests to the men of to-day. It may well be seen in later ages to fix as truly the turning-point of English history as the extension of Roman dominion beyond the limits of Italy fixed the fate of Rome, or as the attempted conquest of Syracuse determined the fortunes of Athens. One matter is, however, now visible to all observers which naturally escaped the attention of the generation that witnessed the triumphs of Clive and of Hastings. The establishment of American independence and the conquest of India worked curiously together towards the same result. They caused English energy to shift from the west to the east. The ship of state, which had, up to 1760, been directed towards the western world, turned slowly but unmistakably eastward. More and more decidedly has England become an Eastern power. In the East Englishmen have performed their greatest exploits. Towards the East has flowed all that is most energetic in the English nation. As the interests of the country have centred in India, so Eastern questions have more and more engrossed English attention. "Where your treasure is there will your heart be also" is as true of states as of individuals. If any one wishes to see where the heart of England really is, let him compare, what often puzzles foreigners, English apathy about Continental or American questions with English activity and passion in Eastern affairs. The Crimean War was influenced by views with regard to the East; but even so the Russian contest called forth but half the strength of the country. So acute a critic as De Tocqueville fancied that English energy had declined. The Sepoys revolted. Europe expected the fall of the Empire; but the whole vigor of the nation revived, and the Eastern rebels were crushed by the same remorseless force which had, a century before, driven France both from the Western and from the Eastern world.

Fourthly. The new direction given to English energy, combined with the expulsion of French influence from all the fields which Englishmen were inclined to occupy, changed the relations between England and France. The date and extent of this alteration are concealed by the wars of the Revolution and the First Empire. They appear at the first glance to be the continuation of the old rivalry between the two countries. They are, in fact, an unnatural break in an almost irresistible tendency towards friendship which at any moment might become an alliance. The peace by which George III. put an end to the warlike triumphs of Pitt was no doubt the result of a court intrigue: it is difficult to believe that his Majesty saw in it anything else than an arrangement which favored his attack on the Whig leaders. But for all that it really marked a decisive crisis in the relations between the two neighboring nations. The War of Independence offered an opportunity which France could not be expected to miss; but it was popular enthusiasm for liberty, at least, as much as the policy of the Government which led France to aid America. The impulse which had formerly driven Frenchmen and Englishmen into unceasing contests was already dying out. The policy of Chatham,

* History of the English People. By John Richard Green, M.A., Honorary Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford. Vol. IV. New York: Harper & Bros.

though cut short, had so completely done its work that the reasons and interests which justified it had ceased to exist. That this was so was seen when Pitt routed the Coalition. It is the custom to draw a marked contrast between the warlike policy of Chatham and the pacific statesmanship of his son. The one needed, as was said, "an accompaniment of trumpets and trombones"; the triumphs of the other were achieved by successful finance and commercial treaties. The difference in the character of the two men told for much; but we may well doubt whether the difference of the times and the situation did not tell for a great deal more. Pitt came on the public stage as the heir of Chatham. The feeling that he was his father's representative was the source to which the youthful statesman owed half his power. Father and son alike were the heroes of the City. Each found his permanent support in the rising power of the mercantile and industrial classes; each alike had the interest and the honor of these classes at heart. If the father was the constant foe of France, and the son was so averse to a French war that he could only be forced into it by the demands of a nation maddened by the horrors of the Reign of Terror, it is surely reasonable to suppose that the difference in policy was based on something more solid than a difference of individual character. The cause is to be found in a general change of national interests and sentiment. Till 1760 France was a dangerous rival to the development of England's commercial empire. Hence French power was combated by English arms and English subsidies, and Frenchmen were held Britain's natural foes. After 1760 the rivalry ceased. French prosperity promoted the welfare of England, and the greatest English minister of the day cultivated the friendship of France. Change of interest brought, as it always will bring, a change of moral feelings. Every page of such a book as Young's 'Travels' shows, what is well enough known from other sources, that, in spite of French intervention in the War of Independence, there existed in the years immediately preceding the Revolution a lively feeling both in France and in England of reciprocal friendship and sympathy. The *entente cordiale* would have been fully developed before the end of the century had its growth not been interrupted by the violence of the Revolution and the wars of the Empire. When English officers can see without fear as without jealousy the formation of a gigantic naval arsenal at Cherbourg, and when the representative of England can during a parade of the French navy take the opportunity to point out that peace between the two ancient rivals has now lasted for over sixty years, we may be pretty sure that the secular conflict between France and England is at an end. There is no reason, however, for holding either that the Englishmen of the last century who waged constant war with France were fools or brutes, or that the Englishmen of to-day who would feel a breach with France almost like a civil feud are philosophers or philanthropists. It is wiser to observe that Englishmen of to-day are neither better nor worse than their forefathers; that each generation will be found to occupy the position naturally suggested by its interests; and that friendship between what, after all, are the two leading Powers of Europe is the natural result of the influences which have governed what we have termed modern England.

SYMONDS'S SKETCHES AND STUDIES IN SOUTHERN EUROPE.*

MR. SYMONDS'S volumes are of varying interest and value. The essays collected in them have been published heretofore separately and at different periods during the last dozen years, and have no particular association beyond the loose one suggested in the title. Most of them are about places of Southern Europe notable for their natural scenery, their history, or their artistic wealth. All are quite as remarkable, perhaps, for their "glowing, glittering" style as for their contents. Mr. Symonds's sentences have a sort of rhythmical flow that reminds one faintly of Macpherson's 'Ossian,' and, as the author often says about Italian edifices, "Every square inch is encrusted with mosaics"—of rhetoric. It would be difficult to find an equal number of pages of good English wherein adjectives abound with such "prodigious prodigality"—to borrow another expression from Mr. Symonds. Ideas that hardly strike one as needing any particular emphasis whatever are reinforced by an accumulation of phrases; e.g., "No other poet who ever lived, in any age or on any shore" (i. 358). Alliterations are as frequent as in newspaper "display" headings; on the first page of the first essay a distant view "swam into sight from the shifting cloud," and the impression made upon Mr. Symonds was apparently permanent. "Airy azure," "cave of care," "gorgeous gloom," "golden gloom," "haunt of hives," "gaping gateways," "castled crags," "pearled promontories," we encounter in close succession. The descriptions of scenes and persons are further decorated by parenthetical allusions to other scenes and persons, which must be set down as ornament merely, and that of rather a rococo order. Sometimes these are the result of recollections confessedly singular. Thus (ii. 34):

"The traveller in Sicily, . . . crossing a broken bridge at night in the

lumbering diligence, guarded by infantry with set bayonets, and wondering on which side of the river the brigands are in ambush, . . . suddenly calls to mind that this torrent was the ancient Halycus, the border between Greeks and Carthaginians, established of old and ratified by Timoleon, after the battle of Crimisus."

This, we should say, would depend altogether on who the traveller was, and how much of his classical dictionary he had in mind while in nervous ignorance as to which side the brigands were on. Mr. Symonds's imagination is a lively one, however. While looking at San Lorenzo, one winter day, "by one of those strange freaks of the brain to which we are all subject," he suddenly fancied himself "in the close of Salisbury on a perfumed summer afternoon." Then, in an instant, he was back in Perugia again, the vision having been "but a momentary dream, a thought that burned itself upon a fancy overtaken by passionate images."

A writer who takes things so seriously may be imagined to be sufficiently impressed by the commonplace to make him in the main a trustworthy guide, rhetoric aside. This is true, to a considerable extent, with Mr. Symonds. Those portions of the essays devoted to art and artists, though invariably enthusiastic, and occasionally ecstatic, are generally of an ultra orthodoxy, the opinions expressed those which we all ought to entertain, and the emotions described those which we all ought to feel. Where a received opinion is called in question it is apt to concern some point on which, from the nature of the case, no definite conclusion can be drawn—e.g., it is suggested in regard to the bronze equestrian statue of Bartolommeo Colleoni, at Venice, that too much praise is usually given to Verocchio, to whom the design of the work is attributed, and too little to Leopardi, who executed it, no reason whatever being given for the suggestion. So in more important matters we find an unsatisfactoriness resulting from the same cause. A considerable portion of most of the essays is historical. But before accepting any statement in the exact form in which it appears in Mr. Symonds's text the reader should look at the foot-notes, and in the absence of these he would do well to consult authorities more professedly historical. In the essay on "Rimini" the author says of Sigismondo Pandolfo Malatesta: "It is enough to mention that he murdered three wives in succession, Bussoni di Carmagnuola, Guinipera d'Este, and Polissena Sforza, on various pretexts of infidelity. . . . He died in wedlock with the beautiful and learned Isotta degli Atti, who had for some time been his mistress" (ii. 95). This is very positive; yet in a foot-note the author tells us that, in regard to his first wife, it admits of doubt "whether Sigismondo murdered her, as Sansorino seems to imply in his *Famiglie Illustri*, or only repudiated her," and in regard to his marriage with Isotta "there is some uncertainty." What a writer "seems to imply" is a rather slender support for a charge of wife-murder, but perhaps Mr. Symonds thought that in the case of such villains as the Malatesta one wife-murder more or less was of little consequence. We may add that it admits of still graver doubt whether all the charges of infidelity were merely "pretexts." In the essay on "Athens" we read: "The Panathenaic pomp, which Pheidias and his pupils carved upon the friezes of the Parthenon, took place once in five years" (ii. 73). In a foot-note: "My purpose being merely picturesque, I have ignored the grave antiquarian difficulties which beset the interpretation of this frieze." But how are we always to know whether Mr. Symonds is to be understood literally or picturesquely? The Panathenaic pomp took place once in *four*, not *five* years, by the way, though we should think the error a misprint were not the force of the Greek word *πεντητηρίς* so often mistaken.

The longest essay in the collection is that on "Florence and the Medici," in which the author endeavors to trace the constitutional history of Florence and the means by which the Medici became "despots." But it is clear that political history is not Mr. Symonds's forte, and the reader may refute him in many places by consulting accessible authorities. On "Lucretius" a wealth of rhetoric has been lavished. The quotations from the 'De Rerum Natura' are numerous, but there are no translations. Some have references to book and verse, some have not. The characterizations of the poem, as a whole, appear to us strained and exaggerated, and the treatment of particular passages often mistaken and based upon a misconception of the poet's aim. One or two points may be particularly noticed here. The quotation at the bottom of p. 343, vol. i., commences in the middle of an indivisible clause; the omitted words are indispensable to the construction of the passage. The passage quoted, p. 349, to illustrate what the author calls "the Lucretian theory of conscience," breaks off in such a way as to leave an erroneous impression. Had he quoted one line more it would have given a different coloring to the whole passage.

Near the close of his essay (p. 365) we find:

"The exordia of the first and second books, the analyses of love in the fourth, the praises of Epicurus in the third and fifth, the praises of Empedocles and Ennius in the first, the elaborate passage on the progress of civilization in the fifth, and the description of the plague at Athens which closes the sixth, are noble instances of the sublimest poetry, sustained and hurried onward by the volume of impassioned improvisation."

* 'Sketches and Studies in Southern Europe.' By John Addington Symonds, author of 'Studies of the Greek Poets,' etc. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880. 2 vols. square 8vo, pp. 394, 368.

The alliteration with which the sentence closes was a temptation Mr. Symonds could not resist. Unhappily it has no applicability. The last subord mentioned in this catalogue is the description of the plague at Athens. It consists of 144 verses, and is in great part a translation of the description of the same event given by Thucydides (ii. 47 *et seq.*) It gives us a high opinion of the Greek scholarship of Lucretius. In many places the translation is so exactly literal that the editors of Lucretius, in settling the text, make conformity to the Greek of Thucydides one of the chief tests by which their choice among various readings is determined. We submit that a careful metrical version of the text of a grave historian in a foreign tongue is not what people generally understand by an "impassioned improvisation."

In the essay on "The Debt of English to Italian Literature" the debt is esteemed much greater than most persons will be willing to admit. "Popular Italian Poetry of the Renaissance," "The Orfeo of Poliziano," and "Popular Songs of Tuscany" consist principally of translations designed to give, as far as is possible in an English dress, an idea of the form as well as the sense of the poetry. Mr. Symonds's accompanying remarks contain much that is instructive, and to most readers will be novel and interesting. "Antinous" is an enquiry into the history and *cult* of that canonized favorite of the Emperor Hadrian, and asks many questions to which it declares no satisfactory answers can be given. An "Appendix" contains a long essay on the history and characteristics of "English Blank Verse," a note on the text of the 'Orfeo' of Poliziano, and a translation of eight sonnets of Petrarch. Of Mr. Symonds as a translator the *Nation* has already spoken in the review of his 'Studies of the Greek Poets.' We have carefully compared with the originals some of the translations from the Italian and the Greek contained in these volumes, and we are acquainted with none better. But when we turn from those essays which professedly consist in great part of translations to the multitudinous quotations from foreign authors with which his pages are interspersed, it is impossible to discover by what principles the author has been guided. Sometimes he tells us where his quotations come from, sometimes he does not. Sometimes he gives only the original, sometimes only a translation, sometimes both the original and a translation, sometimes the same passage in the original in one case and a translation in another, sometimes one original passage with and another without a translation, both on the same page; and all this in such a way that, in the majority of cases, we can see no reason why he should have taken one course rather than another. The proof-reading has been remarkably accurate, a matter alike important and difficult in a book pedantically studded with quotations from different languages, living and dead.

LARNED'S WINDHAM COUNTY.*

THE slow growth of tolerance is perhaps the most valuable, if it be not also the most striking, lesson of the later as of the earlier history of Windham County (see the *Nation* for June 15, 1876). We read on p. 129 how, during the excitement caused by shutting up the port of Boston in the summer of 1774, "Mr. Francis Green, of Boston, one of the 'addressers' and adherents of Governor Hutchinson, having ventured into Connecticut to collect debts and transact private business, was forcibly expelled from Windham town and Norwich." This outrage led Colonel Eleazar Fitch, a French-war veteran, high-sheriff of the county, to assert "that the Norwich and Windham people had acted like scoundrels in treating Mr. Green as they did." His age, services, and the general respect for him saved his person from mob violence, but the people came together and hotly resolved "that they would administer tar and feathers to any blacksmith, barber, miller, or common laborer, 'who should aid said Fitch in any way,' and so his wheat and grass were left standing, and 'the whole of a considerable trade withdrawn from him.'" A few months later, the Rev. Samuel Peters, of Hebron, in an adjoining county, having been mobbed in his home, with the aid of Windham patriots, on account of his toryism, retired to Boston, preparatory to sailing for England. By two friends who accompanied him to that city he sent back two letters, one to his mother and one to Dr. Auchmuty, of New York, containing menacing predictions of what would overtake the traitorous inhabitants of Connecticut. These letters were intercepted and read, and the luckless carriers of private correspondence were made, in default of whipping at the town-post, to run the gauntlet in Windham Village—not quite the Indian gauntlet, but well equipped with kicks, cuffs, and insults. In the same village, while the Non-Importation Agreement was in force, "Jeremiah Clark, a most useful and industrious citizen, had opened a little trade with Newport, exchanging butter and domestic commodities for sugar, molasses, or other articles, by means of two deep boxes put into a bag and laid across the back of his horse. Whether with or without cause, suspicion was aroused that he was *smuggling tea* into the town; whereupon the neighbors assembled with tar and feathers, intercepted him on his way homeward, and only re-

leased him after they had made sure by thorough search that no contraband goods were included in his budget." At the close of the Revolution the Tories of Windham County joined perforce in the general exodus, and with them went Colonel Fitch, to whom life had become hardly tolerable. "It was difficult for him to obtain needful supplies for his family. Ardent Sons of Liberty had decreed 'that no mills should grind for, no merchant sell goods to, a Tory.' He was insulted, watched, guarded, subjected to vexatious and ruinous prosecution."

Exactly fifty years after this unfortunate old man had been forced into exile, the spirit of intolerance showed itself in similar but far more aggravated form, and directed not against a military veteran but against a Quaker girl. The story of Miss Prudence Crandall is too well known or too accessible (in May's 'Recollections of the Anti-Slavery Conflict' and elsewhere) to need lengthy rehearsal here. Her offence began by the admission to her select school for young ladies of a young colored woman, a church member, and unexceptionable but for her complexion and her consequent social disabilities. When Miss Crandall lost by this means all her white pupils, she converted her school into one "for young ladies and little misses of color," and the people of Canterbury not being able to persuade her to remove it to some other locality, a town meeting was called (March 9, 1833) to denounce it. This, too, proving vain, a warrant was served upon one of the pupils from Providence, under an old pauper and vagrant law, "warning her out of town unless her maintenance was guaranteed; 'to be whipped on the naked body not exceeding ten stripes' in default of satisfaction or departure."

"While waiting for legal power to break up the school, Canterbury did its best to make scholars and teacher uncomfortable. Non-intercourse and Embargo Acts were put in successful operation. Dealers in all sorts of wares and produce agreed to sell nothing to Miss Crandall, the stage-driver declined to carry her pupils, and neighbors refused a pail of fresh water, even though they knew that their own sons had filled her well with stable refuse. Boys and rowdies were allowed unchecked, if not openly encouraged, to exercise their utmost ingenuity in mischievous annoyance, throwing real stones and rotten eggs at the windows, and following the school with hoots and horns if it ventured to appear in the street. Not only was Miss Crandall herself assailed with threats of coming vengeance and ejection, but her father in the south part of the town was insulted and threatened."

The desired law was obtained of the Legislature, and the news of its passage welcomed in Canterbury "by the ringing of bells [church bells, of course], firing of cannon, and every demonstration of popular delight and triumph." Sustained by equally intrepid friends, Miss Crandall resisted the law, even going to jail, and on the last appeal succeeded in maintaining herself. Then an attempt was made to burn her house down, and finally, in a night attack, the lower windows were simultaneously dashed to pieces with iron bars. This proved too much for the nerves of the inmates, and the school was shortly given up.

It is impossible to read the accounts we have here summarized without being impressed with the light they shed on the Southern temper and behavior towards Northerners and the freedmen since the war. To judge from the denunciations of the Northern press, one would sometimes conclude that the Southern people were alien to American soil and institutions, a race different from and almost incompatible with our own. Yet, taking into consideration existing circumstances, it cannot be denied that Samuel Hoar's expulsion from South Carolina in 1844 was more excusable than Mr. Francis Green's from Windham in 1774; that it would be hard to match the non-intercourse to which Colonel Fitch was subjected with any similar treatment of *post-bellum* Northern settlers at the South; that the rifling of mails for anti-slavery documents was less outrageous than the punishment of "Peters's spies"; and that no white teacher of the freedmen has had an experience at all comparable in malignity, inhumanity, and unrelenting persistence to that of Miss Crandall. The truth is, and 'A Fool's Errand' should not make us forget it, that the intolerance which connects the two epochs and sections has a common explanation: the human mind was not free. If you ask what is the essential difference to-day between the civilization of Connecticut and of any Southern State, the answer must be the degree of freedom attained. For a test of this let us take, on the one hand, the fact that communications to the Northern press from the South on public occurrences are almost invariably anonymous by request, from alleged motives of prudence, and, on the other, the following extract from a recent letter to a Baltimore paper. The writer, Dr. Bagby, is a Virginian, who is avowedly studying "New England by the Back Door." In his progress he reaches Litchfield, Conn., whence he reports:

"I am dumb. Here I have been in Yankee-land for a fortnight, not looking for but fully expecting to see something or hear somebody to 'get mad at,' but have neither seen nor heard anything of the kind. Nobody has insulted me, made mouths at me, or so much as pried into my business. Truth to tell, there is less curiosity in these villagers than among our own; the bump of inquisitiveness on the Yankee head seems to have caved in. They are accustomed to strangers, I suspect."

We have left ourselves little space to enumerate the readable features of the present instalment of this laborious and highly deserving work. Eccle-

* 'History of Windham County, Connecticut. By Ellen D. Larned.' Vol. II. 1760-1880. Brooklyn, N. Y.: Kroyal Faine, 634 Monroe Street. 1880.

siastical affairs continue to fill a large portion of the narrative, and to furnish their share of amusement and instruction. The singularly benevolent and humanizing ministry of the late Rev. Samuel J. May is depicted with considerable detail, as was most proper, and Miss Larned's sketch of him makes what amends it can for a biography of this admirable man, which has yet to be undertaken. Putnam is the military hero of the Revolutionary era, but is seen besides in various humbler rôles—as a compromiser of church squabbles, an inn-keeper in self-defence, a bell-ringer, even—and is followed to his end in a happy old age. Another leader, General Samuel McClellan, whose portrait, like Putnam's and some of the clerical and political worthies, is given, was the great-grandfather of General George B. McClellan. Nathan Hale came from Windham County, and so did General Nathaniel Lyon, who fell early in the rebellion in Missouri. Godfrey Malbone also figures here as a Tory churchman who manages to escape the popular indignation. To him are ascribed the enquiry: "How much are you sorry?" and the reply: "Well, I'm sorry twenty dollars." From Windham went Manasseh Cutler, one of the chief promoters of the Ohio Company and of the Northwest Ordinance; and General Cleveland, founder of the city bearing his name. The Burleigh brothers, reformers, teachers, and writers, were natives of Windham County; and their co-worker, Theodore D. Weld, was brought up there. The great temperance movement of the second quarter of the century is traced by Miss Larned within her chosen bounds. The transformation and redemption of the county by the rise of manufactures form a graphic chapter of extraordinary interest. It is stated on p. 590 that of the foreign population attracted by the varied industries of the county the French operatives, who form more than half, "with scarce an exception, take their savings back to Canada, and make no attempt to assimilate with the Yankees." They therefore appear to be the Chinese of Connecticut, and should be looked after by the local Kearneys. Miss Larned has enlivened her text with numerous anecdotes, like that of the Windham wife who, her husband having been brought home drunk, thanked God he was not a blood relation; or of the good sister who half filled her pastor's cup of tea with molasses, adding "another souse" when he remonstrated with her, and the flattering explanation—"Clear molasses an't too good for Mr. Russel."

XXII Ballades in Blue China. By A. Lang. (London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1880.)—Mr. Lang's verses are undeniably clever, but they have the defect—for trifles a serious defect—of being a little uninteresting. The reader speedily comes to the conclusion that either this sort of thing can be done by one clever man as well as by another, or Mr. Lang has no special aptitude for sonnetteering. We hardly need the dedication to Mr. Austin Dobson to remind us that the former notion is untenable, but the absence of any palpable blemishes in Mr. Lang's *ballades* suggests caution in too quickly inferring the latter. Formally they are admirable. Now and then a line is overrun in cases that betray indolence; more rarely there is a metrical halt—e. g., in the *ballade* on the Jesuits, where one has to shift the accent of "Escobar" from the penult in the refrain to the ultimate in the text. But in general they are attentively rounded, the sentiment of the theme is summed up in the *envoy* after the approved model, the diction smooth and tripping, and the rhyming felicitous. The thought, however, thus set seems satisfied with attaining respectability, and can scarcely be called poetic; it is much, indeed, if it avoids the distinctly prosaic note which in such circumstances rarely escapes common place. The daintiness of significance does not keep pace with the daintiness of form; and where substance and form are closely interblended the result witnesses the universality of the law in such matters which prescribes a reduction of the whole to the lower level. The prettiest conceit in the volume is perhaps the *envoy* of the "Ballade of the Book-Hunter":

"Prince, all the things that tease and please—
Fame, hope, wealth, kisses, cheers, and tears—
What are they but such toys as these;
Aldines, Bodonis, Elzevirs?"

It would be churlish to insist on the banality of the moral; but Mr. Lang is perhaps overfond of repeating it at this date, and when it is a balladist's best, the reflection that his inspiration is not too spontaneous is irresistible. The range of these lyrics is worth pointing out as well as their execution, but their range also illustrates the facility of the clever amateur, and the very evenness of their excellence testifies to an essential artificiality that is at bottom the true source of their lack of interest and makes them hard reading for trifles. It is in a line with this to note that the translations are better, in the sense of having more meat, than the purely original pieces. It cannot, however, be denied that both show a nice susceptibility to poetry and a sympathetic regard for the minor strains of literature; but Mr. Lang's agreeable prose has shown these qualities abundantly, and his verses are not likely to do anything beyond confirming the fact.

God's Acre Beautiful; or, The Cemeteries of the Future. By W. Robinson, F.L.S. 8vo, pp. vii.-128. Illustrations. (London: The Garden Office; New York: Scribner & Welford. 1880.)—Mr. Robinson considers

the subject of urn-burial in this volume from the side of æsthetics and of sentiment, adding, however, an appendix in which the sanitary objections to the ordinary method of interment are pointed out. After discussing the deformity of crowded graveyards, and showing that in or near great cities at least they do not afford a final place of rest, but are, on the contrary, violated, sooner or later, to make room either for new occupants or for new constructions, the author describes the "cemetery of the future" as he would have it. "Permanent and inviolable it must be, with ample space for open green lawns. It is to be a national garden in the best sense; safe from violation as the *via sacra*, and having the added charms of pure air, trees, grass, and flowers." Mr. Robinson's plan for a metropolitan cemetery requires a massive architectural wall and covered way, "as lasting as rock," for the *columbarium* to contain the niches for the greater part of the urns. It should be far enough within the boundary of the land occupied to be completely screened from the adjacent region, except where a fine prospect could be had, by avenues of tall trees. The entire structure should enclose a garden and the necessary supplementary buildings. Nearly adjoining the great covered way ornamental tombs for urns should be provided, after the Roman custom, in which a single tomb served as a family burial-place.

"In old Roman cemeteries beautiful tombs may yet be seen, with the urns within them in as good order as when placed there two thousand years ago. The expense which is now spread over a variety of graves, head-stones, and the purchase of ground, would build a tomb which might endure for ages. What a contrast between the noble Roman woman, surrounded by her maidens and friends, herself bearing her husband's ashes to the tomb, and the black array, the paid mutes, and the hideous box in which the remains of humanity are nailed up for a decay as needless as it is odious! These buildings would save all inscriptions and memorials of the dead from the ravages of time and weather—a gain which no one will undervalue. The buildings within and near the covered way, with their accompanying groves, should not occupy more than a fourth of the whole space. The covered way should not be the work of one man or period."

Within, as well as without, the wall of the *columbarium* there would be room "for much noble tree-planting," care being taken that the larger trees be not planted so near the tombs as to risk the disturbance of their foundations by the growth of the roots. Evergreens, and the dwarf flowering, weeping, or columnar trees, should be placed near these buildings; and in the central spaces would be found opportunity for the most skilful landscape gardening. "The open central lawns should be preserved from the follies of the geometrical and stone gardeners." At the entrance to the whole should stand a church or a classic temple.

Mr. Robinson points out that urn-burial would have the advantages of being practicable "in churches and city graveyards to any extent"; that it would lead to the preservation of large cemeteries now in use, of which the fate, after they are filled and closed in, is always doubtful; and that it would lead to the beautifying for this purpose of open spaces in cities. He does not approve the ancient method of shroud-burial, or the basket-burials recently advocated, finding in them, and justly, in cases where the risk exists of air or water contamination, an added danger in the greater rapidity of the chemical resolutions. Of his defence of cremation it is not necessary to say much, the arguments, for better and for worse, being mostly those with which we are all familiar. We may note two of the errors which he makes in common with most of the advocates of cremation. He underrates the rapid and powerful disinfectant action of fresh, dry earth—an action so potent that if all the dead could be buried in properly-chosen country soil there would be no need of cremation for sanitary reasons. As a consequence, Mr. Robinson fails to distinguish quite as clearly as the subject requires that it is in towns and cities that the value of cremation, whether for sanitary, economical, or even sentimental reasons, is great; while it is much less in the case of country interments. To the most serious argument that is brought against the adoption of the practice, that it would give immunity to poisoners, Mr. Robinson replies, with Sir Henry Thompson, that "the evil, in the shape of disease and death, which results from the present system of burial in earth is larger than the evil caused by secret poisoning is or could be"; and, somewhat more cogently, with M. Lavel's argument in favor of a greater strictness in the matter of the death-certificate.

We venture to quote a part of Lord Ronald Gower's version, given in Mr. Robinson's appendix, of "a somewhat rare brochure" which describes the violation of the royal sepulchres at St. Denis during the French Revolution:

"The work of destruction commenced early in October, 1793, and lasted all the month. The first corpse found was that of Henri IV., the once beloved Henri de Navarre. Some curiosity, if not affection, still seems to have lingered even among those body-snatchers, and the Béarnais was propped up against the church wall in his shroud, and became quite an attraction for the crowd. One of the republican guards even condescended to cut off the king's gray, upturned moustache and place it on his lip; another removed the beard, which he declared he would keep as a relic. After this . . . the body was thrown into a huge pit filled with quicklime, into which followed those of its ancestors and descendants. On the next day the corpses of Henri IV.'s wife, Marie de Médicis, Louis XIII., and Louis

XIV. were added to this. The body of the Sun King (as Louis XIV.'s courtiers loved to call him) was as 'black as ink.' . . . By a strange chance, on the very morning that Marie Antoinette's sufferings came to an end in the Place de la Révolution, the body of another unfortunate queen again saw the light of day. On the 16th of October the body of our Queen Henrietta Maria, who died in 1669, was taken from its coffin and added to the ghastly heap in the 'ditch of the Valois,' as the pit into which these royal remains were hustled was called. That of her daughter, the once 'Belle Henriette,' came next; then in quick succession the bodies of Philippe d'Orléans; of his son, the notorious Regent; of his daughter, the Duchesse de Berri; of her husband, and of half-a-dozen infants of the same family. . . . The resurrectionists began by the Bourbons and had still to disinter all the Valois, and further back, up to the Capetian line, and are not content until the almost legendary remains of Dagobert and Madame Dagobert reappear. After Louis the Well-Beloved had been disposed of, came in succession, like the royal ghosts seen by Macbeth, Charles V., who died in 1380, whose body was one of the few well preserved, arrayed in royal robes, with a gilt crown and sceptre, still bright; his wife, Jeanne de Bourbon, who still held in her hand a decayed distaff of wood," etc.

But we must not linger, even upon a theme which casts the interest of Mr. Robinson's proper subject into the shade. His book is the most attractive of recent contributions to the subject of cremation and urn-burial. The illustrations are charming pieces of wood-engraving.

Deep-Sea Sounding and Dredging. By Lieutenant-Commander C. D. Sigsbee, U.S.N. (Washington: Government Printing-Office.)—This book, which is the first extended treatise on the subject ever published, describes the methods and appliances, chiefly from a mechanical standpoint, used on board the Coast Survey steamer *Blake*, while under the author's command, and is destined to provide a guide for those who may hereafter have charge of deep-sea work. The sounding-machine used on board the *Blake* was the invention of Lieutenant-Commander Sigsbee, a modification of Sir William Thomson's original machine for sounding with wire. The improved machine gave such admirable results that "in two thousand fathoms' depth the *Blake* (of three hundred and fifty tons measurement) was enabled, in nearly all weathers, to sound and obtain serial temperatures continuously, day and night, with a probable error in sounding not exceeding one-quarter of one per cent. of the depth, even during moderately heavy gales." Nearly all the apparatus for sounding and dredging used on board the *Blake* was new, or modified from previous forms, and was peculiar to that vessel. Sigsbee's water-cup, which is the first and only instrument of its kind, is an ingenious invention by which specimens of water can be obtained from any desired depth; and a more recent invention of the author's, which has been tested this summer and given satisfactory results, enables the naturalist to get specimens of animal life from any depth between the surface and bottom. With a complete outfit of this kind the *Blake*, under the command of Lieutenant-Commander Sigsbee, was engaged for four years in the physical survey of the Gulf of Mexico and Gulf of Florida, and systematic and perfectly-recorded observations were made, with the object of investigating depths throughout the Gulfs of Mexico and Florida, temperatures from surface to bottom over the same area, character of the bottom and of the water from surface to bottom, surface and under currents, and animal life from surface to bottom; the whole yielding "valuable results towards a more definite conception of the flow, mass, and direction of the Gulf Stream." During a part of the work Mr. Alexander Agassiz was embarked on board the *Blake*, and superintended the dredging and trawling. At his suggestion wire rope was substituted for hemp in the dredging-machine; he has already made public some of the results. After four years' service, Lieutenant-Commander Sigsbee, having fitted the vessel for another season's work, was relieved by Commander Bartlett. With regard to the work performed by the *Blake*, the Superintendent of the Coast Survey says:

"Without specifying the great results obtained from this continuous research, I may be pardoned in referring with some gratification to the fact that in the small steamer *Blake*, of only three hundred and fifty tons burthen, under the energetic and skilful commands of Lieutenant-Commander Sigsbee and Commander Bartlett, with a full complement of forty-five, including officers and crew, more rapid work was done than had been accomplished with the old methods and appliances by the *Challenger*, a vessel of over two thousand tons burthen, with a complement of twenty-nine naval and civil officers and a correspondingly large crew."

A noticeable and important feature of the work is the exact navigation of the *Blake*. On the correctness of the ship's observed positions the whole value of a line of soundings with the attendant observations obviously depends. The most precise methods were used in the navigation and record, and the comprehensive scope of what is known as Sumner's method—a method but little in use among practical navigators—is very clearly shown in this volume. It should be added that a large number of illustrations, most of them heliotype plates of the apparatus, accompany the text.

Journals and Journalism; with a Guide for Literary Beginners. By "John Oldcastle." 1880. Price three shillings and sixpence. (London: Field

and Tuer, ye Leadenhalle Presse, E.C. 16mo, pp. 141.)—This is a handbook to journalism as a profession. It is calculated for the meridian of Greenwich, but its advice is sound for those who count from the meridian of Washington. Its aim is to show the beginner how to begin, and to give him elementary information about the methods of the newspaper and the unwritten laws thereof. It would be of slight use in any of the schools of journalism of which we used to hear so much, for it is not concerned with the perfection of the would-be journalist; it takes the more characteristically British course of indicating merely the ways of disposing of whatever the beginner may write. The successive chapters discuss "Literary Amateurs," "Introduction to Editors," "How to Begin," "Declined with Thanks," "Pounds, Shillings, and Pence," "Journalism as a Career," "In an Editor's Chair," and a few kindred topics. The "ten commandments" promulgated by the author for the government of the literary beginner prescribe the use of black ink and of small sheets of paper (and only one side of them), legibility, punctuality, and the like. Unlike most authors of primers for professional novices, he does not overrate the advantages of journalism as a calling, setting forth both sides fairly. He gives interesting particulars of the rates of pay on the leading English reviews and magazines; and if his figures are accurate, as we have reason to believe them to be, the reward of the magazine writers is less in England than it is here. At least, we infer that the best American magazines pay their best writers better than do the corresponding English publications, though the average pay of literary labor is probably as high in England as with us. Those who were interested in the series of instructive confessions which appeared not long ago in the Contributors' Club of the *Atlantic Monthly*, as to the pecuniary rewards of various American writers, will find in this volume somewhat similar revelations in regard to literary profits in England. Pertinent quotations are made from leading journalists, and personal references—wholly inoffensive—are frequent. Variety is given to the page by the introduction in the margin of the facsimile autograph of the literary man whose name may have been mentioned in the text, and most of the leading English journalists of the day are thus commemorated. Nearly forty pages are filled with a useful "Dictionary of the Periodical Press," and a list of the chief English publications, with a running commentary of information and anecdote.

The make-up of the volume is odd. The paper is an old-fashioned tint; the type and initials are antique; and the book is half-bound in vellum, with catgut stitching boldly in view; the corners are calf; and the sides—where in an ordinary half-bound book the paper would be—are thin sheep, on which, however, the title is printed in black.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.	Publishers.—Prices.
Allen (Prof. W. F.), Introduction to Latin Composition.....	(Ginn & Heath)
Agricola of Tacitus.....	"
Bulkeley (Dr. L. D.), The Skin in Health, and Disease.....	(Presley Blakiston) 80 50
Cooly's Cyclopaedia of Practical Receipts, 2 vols.....	(D. Appleton & Co.)
Dickens (C.), The Mudfog Papers, etc.....	(Henry Holt & Co.) 1 00
Flagg (Prof. I.), Hellenic Orations of Demosthenes.....	(Ginn & Heath)
Hale (Dr. Amie M.), Management of Children.....	(Presley Blakiston) 50
Jones (C. H.), Short Life of W. E. Gladstone.....	(D. Appleton & Co.)
Katscher (L.), Bilder aus dem englischen Leben, swd.....	(W. Friedrich)
Knox (Mrs. N. L.), Elementary Lessons in English, Part I.....	(Ginn & Heath)
Kirkman (M. M.), Railway Expenditures, 2 vols.....	(Railway Age Pub. Co.)
Lang (A.), XXII Ballades in Blue China.....	(C. Kegan Paul & Co.)
McDonald (Gen. J.), Secrets of the Great Whiskey Ring.....	(Belford, Clarke & Co.) 2 00
McLaughlin (Louise), Pottery Decoration under the Glaze.....	(Robt. Clarke & Co.) 1 00
McPherson (E.), Hand-Book of Politics for 1880.....	(James J. Chapman) 2 00
Moore (Rev. D.), The Christian in his Relations to the Church, the World, and the Family.....	(Cassell, Petter & Galpin) 75
(Morris (E. P.), The Mostellaria of Plautus.....	(John Allyn) 1 25
Muller (Prof. F. Max), Sacred Books of the East, vols. iv., v., vi.....	(Macmillan & Co.) 6 75
Murdoch (J. E.), The Stage.....	(J. M. Stoddard & Co.) 2 00
New Graft on the Family Tree.....	(D. Lothrop & Co.) 1 50
Newton (C. T.), Essays on Art and Archaeology.....	(Macmillan & Co.) 4 00
Octagon Club: a Tale, swd.....	(G. P. Putnam's Sons) 50
Pateron (J.), Liberty of the Press, Speech, and Public Worship.....	(Macmillan & Co.) 4 00
Poste (E.), Skies and Weather Forecasts of Aratus.....	" 1 25
Pulling (F. S.), Sir Joshua Reynolds.....	(Scribner & Welford) 1 25
Racinet (A.), Le Costume Historique, Part IX.....	(J. W. Bouton) 4 50
Rau (E. A.) and Hervey (A. B.), Catalogue of N. A. Musci, swd.....	(Taunton, Mass.) 50
Rawlinson (Rev. G.), Historical Illustrations of the Old Testament.....	(Henry A. Sumner & Co.)
Robert (K.), Charcoal Drawing without a Master.....	(Robt. Clarke & Co.) 1 00
Rosa (C.), La Famiglia Educatrice, swd.....	(Ernesto Aureli)
Sainte-Beuve (C. A.), Nouvelle Correspondance, swd.....	(F. W. Christern)
Schmidt (H.), Tate's Modern Cambist.....	(Effingham Wilson)
Schwegler (A.), History of Philosophy.....	(D. Appleton & Co.) 2 00
Scoones (W. B.), Four Centuries of English Letters.....	(Harper & Bros.)
Skeat (Rev. W. W.), Etymological Dictionary of the English Language, Part III., Lit.-Recd, swd.....	(Macmillan & Co.)
Spencer (H.), Education: Intellectual, Moral, and Physical, swd.....	(D. Appleton & Co.) 50
Stacke (L.), Deutsche Geschichte, Part II., swd.....	(L. W. Schmidt)
Stephens (F. G.), Sir Edwin Landseer.....	(Scribner & Welford) 1 25
Symonds (J. A.), New and Old: Poetry.....	(J. R. Osgood & Co.)
Van Wageningen (T. F.), Manual of Hydraulic Mining.....	(D. Van Nostrand)
Vago (A. L.), Instructions in the Art of Modelling in Clay.....	(Robt. Clarke & Co.) 1 00
Very (Lieut. E. W.), Navies of the World.....	(John Wiley & Sons) 7 50
Walton (G. A.), Report of Examinations of Schools in Norfolk County, Mass., swd.....	(Lee & Shepard)
Winans (S. R.), Xenophon's Memorabilia of Socrates.....	(John Allyn) 1 50
Wylie (Rev. J. A.), History of the Waldenses.....	(Cassell, Petter & Galpin) 1 25
Zola (E.), Albine, swd.....	(T. B. Peterson & Bros.) 75

